

Under YHWH's Veto: David as Shedder of Blood in Chronicles ⁽¹⁾

I. Orientation: the Problem

1. *The prime texts*

In two separate passages in Chronicles, one addressed to his son Solomon (1 Chr 22,6-11), the other to assembled officials together with all his sons (1 Chr 28,2-7)⁽²⁾, David explains why it is not he himself but Solomon who has been chosen by YHWH to build the temple. In each passage David relates how his own plan to do so was vetoed by YHWH⁽³⁾ because he had shed blood and fought wars. In the first version YHWH encloses his veto within a reiteration of the grounds for his objection:

דם לרב שפכת ומלחמות גדלות עשית לא־תבנה
בית לשמי כי דמים רבים שפכת אֶרְצָה לפני

... blood in plenty you have shed and great wars you have prosecuted:
you shall not build a house for my name, since copious blood you have
shed on the ground in my presence (1 Chr 22,8).

Not only does YHWH stress by repetition the quantity of blood allegedly shed by David, but he heightens the repetition by adding two further qualifying terms (אֶרְצָה לפני 'on the ground in my presence') that focus the issue on how David's shedding blood affects YHWH himself. We shall return to the contextual significance of these terms later in the discussion.

In 1 Chr 28,3, on the other hand, the veto comes first, followed by a motivation clause resembling YHWH's opening assertion in 22,8:

⁽¹⁾ The following is a revised and expanded version of a paper read at the SBL International Meeting 'World Congress of Religions' in Cape Town, RSA, in July 2000.

⁽²⁾ For the issues involved in construing ובניו in 28,1 cf. Madsen in E.L. CURTIS – A.A. MADSEN, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles* (ICC; Edinburgh 1910) 297. But in any case the presence of all David's sons in the assembly of 1 Chr 28,1 is implicated by 1 Chr 29,24 through its anaphoric reference back via 29,20; 29,6; 29,1 to 28,1.

⁽³⁾ In 22,8 David specifies 'the word of YHWH' as the form of mediation, as in 1 Chr 17 = 2 Sam 7; in 28,3 he simply states 'God spoke to me'.

לֹא־תִבְנֶה בַּיִת לִשְׁמִי כִּי אִישׁ מִלְחָמוֹת אָתָּה וְדָמִים שָׁפַכְתָּ

you shall not build a house for my name, because you are a man of wars and blood you have shed (1 Chr 28,3).

This less rhetorical, more matter-of-fact, version condenses 22,8, making the same point more succinctly. It is as though, once having confessed YHWH's veto publicly, David can be more blasé about it here. But what, according to these accounts by the Chronicler's David, is the nub of YHWH's objection to David's building the temple? In particular, are there (1) two disparate grounds for YHWH's objection, i.e. bloodshed, and warfare; or (2) essentially one, i.e. bloodshed occasioned by warfare⁽⁴⁾?

Both the pragmatics of YHWH's utterance in 1 Chr 22,8, and the rhetorical structure of 22,8 and 28,3, provide strongly indicative evidence in favour of the second alternative. First, the pragmatics of 22,8. YHWH begins with an assertion that David shed blood and prosecuted wars (22,8aβγ), to which he juxtaposes paratactically his veto on David's building him a temple (22,8bα). Simple discourse pragmatics accordingly lead to the inference that the initial assertion states the ground for the ensuing veto. Further, in order to ensure that this inference will be drawn, immediately following his veto YHWH repeats his ground, but this time clearly signalling it as motivation by the conjunction כִּי 'for, because' (22,8bβγ). Hence on discourse logic the motivation clause 22,8bβγ will be taken as recapitulating the substance of the initial assertion 22,8aβγ. But the recapitulation refers solely to David's bloodshedding, with no second mention of his warfare. Accordingly the natural discourse inference is that the nub of YHWH's objection to David's building a temple is his having shed blood⁽⁵⁾.

Turning now to the rhetoric, we observe that YHWH not merely refers in 22,8 to David's shedding blood twice against once to his fighting wars, but further, he puts these two references into the prominent first (22,8aβ) and last (22,8bβγ) slots in his sentence, where they form a grimly cogent

(4) Whilst most scholars have taken the second position, the first, held by David Kimhi, has recently been reaffirmed in a different form by B. KELLY, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles* (JSOTSS 211; Sheffield 1996) 84-85; ID., "David's Disqualification in 1 Chronicles 22.8: a Response to Piet B. Dirksen", *JSOT* 80 (1998) 53-61. My discussion develops the case for the second position, highlighting some specific problems in the arguments of Kelly.

(5) KELLY, *Retribution*, 85, draws a parallel conclusion from the fact that 'the charge of 'shedding much blood' occurs twice in 1 Chr 22.8', but he takes that charge to refer to 'bloodshed' other than in warfare: see n. 8 below.

inclusio around his prohibition to David (22,8bα). Moreover, the two references are quantified in hyperbolic terms: 'blood in plenty' (דם לרב 22,8aβ), 'copious blood' (דם רבים 22,8bβ). In the more restrained rhetoric of 28,3 the veto is given first (28,3aβ), followed by its ground in a כִּי clause. The latter cites both warfare and bloodshedding (28,3b), but in that order, thus putting the bloodshed into the more stressed final slot of the sentence, though here without quantification. Hence both pragmatically and rhetorically YHWH's discourse in 22,8 and 28,3 makes quite clear that the core of his objection to David's building the temple is the fact that he has shed much blood⁽⁶⁾.

But this said, the two references to David's warfare (22,8aγ; 28,3b) are each so closely juxtaposed with those to his shedding blood as to induce the pragmatic inference that the former define and delimit the occasions of the bloodshed. Transparently, warfare involves violent killing and, as we shall see in a moment, the expression שֶׁפָּךְ דָּם denotes violent killing. Hence, in discourse logic, to juxtapose שֶׁפָּךְ דָּם and מִלְחָמָה in the way both 22,8 and 28,3 do is to associate the warfare with the bloodshed as cause and effect. Moreover, natural discourse logic in 1 Chr 22,8 leads the reader to see in the quantification of the wars David fought (מִלְחָמוֹת גְּדוֹלוֹת 'great wars') the explanation for the amount of blood he is alleged to have shed (לרב 'in plenty', רבים 'copious')⁽⁷⁾. Thus Chronicles makes quite clear that, whilst the essence of YHWH's veto lies in the fact that David shed blood, the 'blood in plenty' that David shed was in the course of his 'great wars'.

We should also notice the fact that Chronicles gives an exposition of why YHWH did not permit David to build the temple, not once but twice.

⁽⁶⁾ Moreover, the fact that 1 Chr 18,8, a Chronicles plus, explicitly reports that Solomon used proceeds from David's wars in building the temple, and 18,11 // 2 Sam 8,11 that David dedicated spoils of war to YHWH, are further indications that for Chronicles David's warfare in and of itself was not objectionable. Clearly, however, to anticipate here the results of my ensuing discussion, the Chronicler must have believed that these spoils had been decontaminated in accord with Num 31,23. P.B. DIRKSEN, "Why was David Disqualified as Temple Builder?", *JSOT* 70 (1996) 51-56, in arguing from 1 Chr 18,8.11 that for Chronicles warfare was not ritually polluting ("Why was David Disqualified", 52), was evidently unaware of this provision.

⁽⁷⁾ Thus discourse logic and rhetoric combine to make highly improbable the view, espoused by KELLY, "David's Disqualification", 58-59, that 1 Chr 22,8; 28,3 mention 'two reasons for David's disqualification' (ibid., 59; his italics), namely, 1) bloodshedding, and 2) time-consuming involvement in war. See further the discussion of the relation of 1 Kgs 5,17-18 [5,3-4] to 1 Chr 22,8; 28,3 in pp. 460-462 below, and especially n. 13.

Moreover, in these texts David announces publicly, first to Solomon (22,8), and then to his assembled sons and officials (28,3), what YHWH had already revealed to David privately. Clearly, for Chronicles the fact that YHWH quite explicitly forbade to David something that he expressly chose Solomon to do (1 Chr 28,5-6) is a matter in need of explanation, not just privately to David, but also publicly to court and people. Hence, the double exposition shows how significant YHWH's explanation is for the Chronicler, and the very public nature of the second indicates that there is a communal dimension in the explanation that is also important to the Chronicler. This leads to the question, how exactly does the ground YHWH offers David explain, in terms that concern court and people, why David could not build the temple? It is the main purpose of the present article to essay an answer to this question. But it will help our inquiry to deal first with the prior question, what was it YHWH had said to David that Chronicles could take as a veto on David's building the temple, grounded in his bloodshed in warfare?

2. *The immediate sources*

Whilst it is evident that the two addresses of David in 1 Chr 22,7-10 and 28,2-7 each give the gist of the oracle of Nathan already recorded in 1 Chr 17(*), neither 1 Chr 17 nor its source, 2 Sam 7, contains any explicit statement of the kind David attributes to YHWH in 1 Chr 22,8 and 28,3. How, then, did the Chronicler arrive at this formulation of YHWH's veto? He derived it from YHWH's response to David in the Nathan oracle (1 Chr 17,4b-10a // 2 Sam 7,5b-11a) as read in the light of two interpretations in Kings of the same passage⁽⁹⁾. The

(*) Hence Kelly's view (*ibid.*, 58) that the 'bloodshed' being referred to is the slaughter narrated in 1 Chr 21 is ruled out by the fact that in 22,8 and 28,3 David is referring back to a veto YHWH issued in 17,4, i.e. before the events of 1 Chr 21! This is quite apart from Kelly's highly dubious claim that שפך דם could be used to refer to the deaths of 1 Chr 21: see further n. 24 below. For other problems with Kelly's account of our texts, see nn. 13, 25, 37, 48 below.

⁽⁹⁾ Both 1 Chr 22,7-10 and 28,2-7 draw on 1 Kgs 8,16-20 // 2 Chr 6,5-10. 1 Chr 22,7b (cf. 28,2b) employs virtually the precise formulation found in 1 Kgs 8,17 // 2 Chr 6,7, but in first person form. The only other difference from 1 Kgs 8,17 in 1 Chr 22,7 is the minor variant לשם יהוה אלהי ישראל for לשם יהוה אלהי: cf. לשם יהוה אלהי in 1 Kgs 3,17a. Now 1 Kgs 8,17-18 // 2 Chr 6,7-8 paraphrase 2 Sam 7,2-3, and the fact that 1 Chr 22 and 28 parallel the first part of this paraphrase, but do not include the representation of 2 Sam 7,3 in 1 Kgs 8,18 // 2 Chr 6,8, strongly suggests that Kings is the prime version from which Chronicles borrows. Further, 2 Sam 7,6-8 is paraphrased in 1 Kgs 8,16 // 2 Chr 6,6, whence 1 Chr 28,4 derives, but develops in its own way, the lexis of divine choice.

second of the Kings passages (1 Kgs 8,16-20 // 2 Chr 6,5-10), the preface to Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple, supplied the Chronicler with the negative statement form (1 Kgs 8,19a // 2 Chr 6,9a) that resolves into an unambiguous veto (1 Chr 17,4b) the pragmatically more open illocutionary force of YHWH's rhetorical question form in 2 Sam 7,5b⁽¹⁰⁾. The first of the Kings passages, Solomon's message to Hiram of Tyre (1 Kgs 5,17-18 [5,3-4]; no Chr //)⁽¹¹⁾, alerted the Chronicler to the idea that David's involvement in war (1 Chr 17,7-10a // 2 Sam 7,8-11a) was a material factor in that veto. But in thus synthesizing into his own reading of YHWH's response to David in the Nathan oracle these two interpretations sanctioned by Solomon, unlike Solomon (1 Kgs 5,17-18 [5,3-4]) the Chronicler found in YHWH's references to David's involvement in war no merely contingent explanation for why David could not build the temple⁽¹²⁾. For logically, time-consuming occupation with warfare can neither explain nor warrant a divine *veto* on his building the temple⁽¹³⁾.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Compare not only the negative statement form in common between 1 Kgs 8,19a // 2 Chr 6,9a and 1 Chr 17,4b, but also the use in each of the definite הַבַּיִת as against the indefinite בֵּית of 2 Sam 7,5b. 1 Chr 17,4b, however, by moving the negative לֹא from the verb תִּבְנֶה to the pronoun אַתָּה, transmutes this earlier assertion, part of a statement of contrasting contingent facts ('notwithstanding, you as a matter of fact will not build the house, but your son will...'), into a pointed prohibition to David ('*not you* shall build the house...') that is set over against an equally pointed permission ('*he* shall build me a house' 1 Chr 17,12a).

⁽¹¹⁾ The fact that there is no equivalent to 1 Kgs 5,17-18 [5,3-4] in 2 Chr 2,3-10 is no necessary indication that the Chronicler was not aware of the passage, since Chronicles often reflects knowledge of material in Samuel or Kings it has not incorporated into its text.

⁽¹²⁾ The position of Dirksen is potentially confusing, since he maintains on the one hand that in the Hebrew Bible warfare is never counted as bloodshed (DIRKSEN, "Why was David Disqualified", 51-53), but on the other hand that 1 Chr 22,8; 28,3 levels this charge against David precisely for his warfare (ibid., 53-55)! Recognizing that 1 Kgs 5,17-18 [5,3-4] cite simple historical contingency to account for David's failure to build the temple, Dirksen claims that 'to provide a reason for God's intervention in appointing Solomon as the temple builder' 1 Chr 22,8; 28,3 have arbitrarily made 'an *ad hoc* adaptation of 1 Kgs 5,17' that brings against David a charge of bloodshed in war otherwise quite unwarranted in the Hebrew Bible, and incompatible with Chronicles own indication of YHWH's support for David's wars (cf. n. 6 above). My discussion will not only argue that Chronicles' attempt to account for David's disqualification is far less arbitrary and incoherent than Dirksen alleges, but also show that several of Dirksen's own assertions are erroneous: see especially nn. 25, 32, 37, 48 below.

⁽¹³⁾ This reveals another objection to Kelly's account of 1 Chr 22,8 and 28,3. Following Dirksen, Kelly takes the reference to warfare in the two verses to be

YHWH's objection in Chronicles is not, however, to a temple being built, but to David as its builder. The 'house of rest' (בית מנוחה [1 Chr 28,2]) that David as a 'man of wars' (איש מלחמות [28,3]) had been prohibited from building, his son as a 'man of restful peace' (איש מנוחה [22,9]) has been chosen to build (28,5-6). Thus in his public address (28,2-10) David presupposes the content of his earlier address to Solomon (22,8-10), namely YHWH's explicit announcement to David of the birth and future destiny of a son⁽¹⁴⁾. Hence Chronicles presents us with a simple binary opposition, between a David who, as 'man of wars', is manifestly unfit to build the 'house of rest' (28,2-3), and his son Solomon who, as 'man of restful peace', is divinely denominated to be its builder (22,9-10).

3. *Interim appraisal*

Hence at this point in our investigation we might be seduced into thinking that not only have we answered our prior question above—where did Chronicles derive the grounded veto on David's building the temple in 1 Chr 22,8; 28,2?—but also our main question—how does the ground YHWH puts forward explain his veto?—since the notion of David as 'a man of wars' being disqualified from building 'a house of rest' may seem a sufficiently satisfying account of this⁽¹⁵⁾.

borrowed from 1 Kgs 5,17 [5,3], but since he maintains that the 'bloodshed' they refer to is the slaughter in 1 Chr 21, he finds two separate grounds in YHWH's objection (KELLY, "David's Disqualification", 58-59). But (1) on the principles of quantity and quality in discourse logic (H. P. GRICE: *Studies in the Way of Words* (Cambridge [MA] 1989) 22-57), appealing to contingent fact, namely that David was too busy fighting wars, to explain why David did not build the temple, as Solomon does in 1 Kgs 5,17 [5,3], pragmatically excludes a more categorical explanation, namely his divine disqualification from building; (2) conversely, if a categorical ground of disqualification is appealed to, as in 1 Chr 22,8; 28,3, to add an appeal to a merely contingent fact that is no *disqualification* to building would be both logically confusing and rhetorically weak.

⁽¹⁴⁾ D.F. MURRAY, "Dynasty, People and the Future: the Message of Chronicles", *JSOT* 58 (1993) 74, n. 10 = *The Historical Books* (ed. J. Ch. EXUM) (Sheffield Reader; Biblical seminar 40; Sheffield 1997) 285, n. 10, drew attention to the significance of this transformation of YHWH's promise to David into a birth announcement oracle, previously unremarked as such. In thus foretelling the destiny of a single named offspring, the birth announcement oracle format focuses to its sharpest the contrast between David and his divinely-appointed successor. See further D.F. MURRAY *Claim for Power, Power for Claim: the Ideology of a Divine Promise in the Hebrew Bible* (in preparation) ch. 4.

⁽¹⁵⁾ This is in essence the account that R. MOSIS, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1973)

The problem with this account is, however, that Chronicles does not have YHWH charge David merely with being a 'man of wars'. Rather, as we saw at the outset of our discussion, YHWH notably insists still more on a concomitant fact, namely that David has shed much blood. Now, as I shall seek to demonstrate in a moment, on the biblical evidence this is an astounding and shocking charge to lay on David⁽¹⁶⁾. Yet, surprisingly little of this shock and astonishment seems to have registered with scholarship on Chronicles, at any rate within my cognizance⁽¹⁷⁾. If I am right, however, then the questions of how and why the Chronicler makes this charge against David, and moreover makes it the public ground of his disqualification from building the temple, demand further investigation⁽¹⁸⁾. Hence we will need to

94-101, gave; similarly both R.L. BRAUN, *I Chronicles* (WBC 14; Waco 1986) 223-225, and S. JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles* (OTL; London 1993) 397-398.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Thus I find distinctly understated the comment of S. JAPHET, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (Frankfurt a. M. 1989) 476-477: '[t]his interpretation is somewhat damaging to David's image...[h]e does not build the Temple because he is unworthy of the task'. Yet JAPHET, *ibid.*, 476-477, nn. 85-87, note the surprise of the Midrash on Chronicles at the charge, and details how both it and David Kimhi attempted to deal with the problem.

⁽¹⁷⁾ A recent exception to this is DIRKSEN, "Why was David Disqualified", 51, who rightly deems the charge 'strange and unexpected', but, as will emerge below, mostly for the wrong reasons.

⁽¹⁸⁾ The commentaries deal with the point very summarily. Thus MADSEN, *Chronicles*, 257, merely notes: '[t]he Chronicler was the first to state that David could not build the Temple because he had *shed much blood* (cf. 28³), which may be nothing more than a religious interpretation of 1 K. 5¹⁷'. W. RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher* (HAT 1.21; Tübingen 1955) 151, registers surprise, not at the charge of דם שפך itself, but because 'nach der Meinung des Chr. die Kriege Davids von Jahwe unterstützt (18 6.13) [...] nicht gar veranlaßt waren (14 10.14-15)'. J.M. MYERS, *I Chronicles* (AncB 12; New York 1965) 154, contents himself with denominating the charge of shedding blood 'a more or less ritual reason', claiming, with reference to Rudolph, that the Chronicler's 'strong psychological revulsion against bloodshed' is due to 'advanced thought ... still not fully appreciated'. BRAUN, *I Chronicles*, 223-226, totally ignores the reference to bloodshed in favour of the war vs. peace contrast, and Johnstone's brief comment brings 1 Chr 21 into the reckoning (W. JOHNSTONE, *1 & 2 Chronicles* [JSOTSS 253; Sheffield 1997] I, 240): against this see nn. 8 above and 24 below. Whilst both H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (London 1982) 154 (see further n. 36 below) and JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, 397-398, offer some attempts to account for the charge of דם שפך in relation to war, neither registers surprise that the Chronicler should lay such a grave charge against David. None of the cited commentators note that these are the only occurrences of the expression in Chronicles, and the only texts in the Hebrew Bible to make the charge against any Israelite warrior for killing in warfare.

consider, first the general usage of the expression שפך דם in the Hebrew Bible, and then some material from Numbers that can explain how and why Chronicles has YHWH lay this charge against David.

II. שפך דם in the Hebrew Bible⁽¹⁹⁾

1. שפך דם *outside Chronicles*

In addition to its three occurrences in the two Chronicles texts already noted above, the expression שפך דם when used of a human agent shedding human blood occurs some 33 times in the Hebrew Bible⁽²⁰⁾. In some 15 of these instances violent death is either explicit, or unambiguously implicated, in each context⁽²¹⁾, and it is to be presumed in virtually all of the other, slightly more ambiguous, cases. The one clear exception is 1 Kgs 18,28, where the expression mockingly refers to blood shed by prophets of Baal ritually cutting themselves, but inferably not to the point of death⁽²²⁾! In the overwhelming majority of instances the expression designates lethal violence perpetrated by ordinary citizens in civil-religious life against other ordinary members of the community not deserving of death⁽²³⁾, and comprises homicides of passion (e.g. 1 Sam 25,31; Ezek 18,10 etc.), malice aforethought (e.g. Gen 37,22), or, in at least one case, of children in sacrifice (Ps 106,38)⁽²⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁹⁾ For some general remarks on this see B. KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, "דם dām" *ThWAT* II, 256-258 = *TDOT* III, 241-243, and, in more detail, the study of H. CHRIST, *Blutvergießen im Alten Testament. Der gewaltsame Tod des Menschen untersucht am Hebräischen Wort dām* (ThDiss 22; Basel 1977).

⁽²⁰⁾ These other instances are Gen 9,6; 37,22; Num 35,33; Deut 19,10; 21,7; 1 Sam 25,31; 1 Kgs 2,31; 18,28; 2 Kgs 21,16; 24,4; Isa 59,7; Jer 7,6; 22,3.17; Ezek 16,38; 18,10; 22,3.4.6.9.12.27; 23,45; 24,7; 33,25; 36,18; Joel 4,19 [3,19]; Ps 79,3.10; 106,38; Prov 1,16; 6,17; Lam 4,13. Additionally, Zeph 1,17, of YHWH 'shedding' human blood, may be cited, where the expression combines the simile of pouring out [blood] like dust with the technical sense of שפך דם.

⁽²¹⁾ These instances are Gen 9,6; 37,2; Num 35,33; Deut 19,10; 21,7; 1 Sam 25,31; 1 Kgs 2,31; Jer 22,3.17; Ezek 18,10; 22,27; Joel 4,19 [3,19]; Ps 79,3.10; 106,38.

⁽²²⁾ Indeed, in the narrative the putting to death of the prophets of Baal is reserved to Elijah and orgiastic Israelites (1 Kgs 18,40).

⁽²³⁾ This is often indicated by appending to the form of דם in the expression either the adjective נקי, as e.g. in Deut 19,10; 2 Kgs 21,16; 24,4; Isa 59,7 etc.; or זרם, as in 1 Sam 25,31; 1 Kgs 2,31.

⁽²⁴⁾ Thus the two elements of violence and fatality are semantically constitutive for the expression שפך דם. This in itself is fatal to Kelly's attempt to find in the slaughter of 1 Chr 21 the grounds for this charge against David in 1 Chr

Moreover, it is abundantly clear that in the biblical perspective שפך דם constitutes a heinous offence that merits both human and divine condemnation, and incurs the penalty of death for the perpetrator.

Of the 33 non-Chronicles instances of שפך דם used of human agents shedding human blood three, and only three, use the expression of lethal violence perpetrated by warriors in war⁽²⁵⁾. The warriors in Ps 79,3.10 are the nations, God's enemies, and the context is one of appeal to YHWH to avenge the undeserved slaughter of his not-so-guilty servants. In Joel 4,19 [3,19] Egypt and Edom are threatened with desolation for their bloody violence against the innocent of Judah. Although neither context makes perspicuous why שפך דם appropriately characterizes their deeds, it is noteworthy that in both texts the charge is laid against Israel's enemies. Furthermore, granted that the violence so characterized in both is perpetrated against an enemy people, it is perpetrated against non-combatant civilians, not combatant soldiers.

A point that emerges clearly from this evidence is that the expression שפך דם is never, outside of Chronicles, used to denote killing by *Israelite* warriors in the context of war. Moreover, that a fundamental distinction could be made between fatal violence against an opposing fighter in a military context (דמי מלחמה) on the one hand and against a fellow citizen in a civil context (שפך דם) on the other, is demonstrated by comparing what David says to Solomon in 1 Kgs 2,5 with what Solomon says to Benaiah in 2,31. In his last words to Solomon, David exhorts him to punish Joab, whom David accuses of having pursued a vendetta in peace-time against Abner and Amasa. David alleges that Joab, wrongly and culpably, counted Abner's killing of Joab's brother Asahel in war (2 Sam 2,18-23) as on a par with peace-time killings (ישם דמי-מלחמה בשלם [1 Kgs 2,5aβ]), and thus as subject to the same responsibilities for blood-vengeance

22,8 and 28,3. Although fatal, pestilence does not involve violent assault by one human on another, nor is its perpetrator here David, albeit that he is the mediate cause for it. Kelly's appeal, "David's Disqualification", 60, to 'the examples of Ezek 22' as evidence that שפך דם should not be pressed in the strictly literal sense of 'spilling blood' even were it convincing, would not get around the fact that שפך דם denotes lethal physical violence, not merely 'culpably causing the death of', as Kelly asserts.

⁽²⁵⁾ These passages, or at least their import, appear to have been missed by CHRIST, *Blutvergießen*, DIRKSEN, "Why was David Disqualified", and KELLY, "David's Disqualification", who all wrongly claim that the expression is never used of killing in warfare in the Hebrew Bible.

(26) [1 Kgs 2,5b] ויתן דמי־מלחמה בחגרתו אשר במתניו ובנעלו אשר ברגליו. When Solomon commands the execution of David's last wishes, he uses the highly charged expression דם שפך to characterize Joab's killings of Abner and Amasa as unlawful civil homicides. Hence the death of the murderer (והסירת דמי חנם אשר שפך יואב מעלי ומעל בית אבי) [1 Kgs 2,31b] must ward off the bloodguilt they incur⁽²⁷⁾.

From these texts, then, we may infer that killings in battle (דמי מלחמה) are conceived of as belonging to a sphere of their own where they are not criminal offences, and thus neither incur bloodguilt nor are subject to the process of blood-vengeance. According to David, Joab's killings of Abner and Amasa, as peace-time killings allegedly in revenge for war-time killings, violate this distinction of spheres. Consequently as דמי חנם 'gratuitous killings' they are not instances of דמי מלחמה, but are subject instead to the bloodguilt and blood-revenge of דם שפך.

2. דם שפך in *Chronicles*

The preceding discussion has now put us in a position to appreciate just how astounding a charge *Chronicles*' YHWH lays against David in accusing him of דם שפך in 1 Chr 22,8 and 28,3, astounding on three counts. The first is the gravity of the charge: the biblical evidence is clear that דם שפך is the most heinous offence one human can commit against another⁽²⁸⁾, on a par with idolatrous worship as an offence against God⁽²⁹⁾. The second count is that the offences YHWH cites are David's killings in war. But, with the exceptions of Ps 79,3,10 and Joel 4,19 [3,19], explicable as charging Israel's enemies with gratuitous killing of innocent civilians, killing in battle is manifestly not elsewhere regarded as culpable homicide of the kind designated by

⁽²⁶⁾ Compare also 2 Sam 3,30, where it is not clear whether the verse is part of the words of David, or the narrator's comment. Though the language of 1 Kgs 2,5b is transparent, its pragmatic meaning is uncertain, as already the first person suffixes in the LXX indicate. M. Noth, *Könige. I. Teilband. 1. Könige 1–16* (BK 9.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1983 [1968]) 31, tentatively suggested that the idiom in MT indicates treacherous killing. I take it, rather, as David's allegation that Joab had deliberately stained basic items of his clothing, worn in both military and civil life, with Asahel's blood, so as always to carry with him a token that will remind him to take blood-vengeance.

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. Num 35,31.33, and below pp. 467-470. Where the murderer's identity cannot be determined, the bloodguilt must be purged from the community with a special ceremony, according to Deut 21,1-9.

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. e.g. Gen 9,6; Deut 19,10; 1 Sam 25,31; and the discussion of Num 35,33-34 below.

⁽²⁹⁾ So Jer 7,6; 22,17; Ezek 22,4; 33,25; 36,18; Ps 106,38.

שפך דם. The final count is that these charges against David are the only occurrences of the expression in the whole of Chronicles. Not against Abijah or Asa, or any other warrior king in Chronicles is the charge made, nor is Saul, or the vengeful Joash, or any other wicked king accused of שפך דם⁽³⁰⁾; none but David alone stands so accused in Chronicles, and that not once, but three times.

The piquancy these observations impart to the fact that it is in Chronicles of all texts where YHWH lays so grave a charge against David gives added urgency to the question, why? The answer has already been anticipated in part in our opening examination of the Chronicles passages in question, where it was argued that the charge of שפך דם was the nub of YHWH's veto against David's building the temple, and that this charge is evidently regarded by the Chronicler as a commensurate ground for the veto. But the foregoing discussion has thrown up the problem of explaining both how Chronicles, uniquely in the biblical text, has charged an Israelite with שפך דם from his involvement in war, and why just this charge should appeal to the Chronicler as commensurate ground for the veto on David's building the temple. A biblical answer to these questions may be found in a book whose influence on Chronicles in general is well attested, the book of Numbers⁽³¹⁾. Hence we will now turn to two passages in Numbers germane to our inquiry.

III. The שפך דם in Num 35, and the דרני נפש in Num 31

The preceding discussion has shown that the expression שפך דם in the Hebrew Bible designates, when both agent and patient are human beings, an act of violent homicide within a civil and/or religious

⁽³⁰⁾ Chronicles has no equivalents to 1 Sam 25,31; 1 Kgs 2,31; 18,28; 2 Kgs 21,16; 24,4; and the expression occurs in special material only in 1 Chr 22,8; 28,3. Hence the very charge Kings kept in reserve as cap to its indictment of the wicked Manasseh as destroyer of Judah (2 Kgs 21,16; 24,4: the charge is laid against no other king in Kings) Chronicles has astonishingly hijacked to lay against David.

⁽³¹⁾ For a pertinent instance, see below pp. 474-476, and for the evidence in general see J.R. SHAVER, *Torah and the Chronicler's History Work. An Inquiry Into the Chronicler's References to Laws, Festivals, and Cultic Institutions in Relationship to Pentateuchal Legislation* (BJSt 196; Atlanta 1989); for references see 'Numbers' in his index of passages. It is of course not necessarily implied that the Chronicler was familiar with the book precisely as we now have it. Note that whilst CHRIST, *Blutvergießen*, 57, brought Num 31,19 into the end of his brief discussion of 1 Chr 22,8; 28,3 (ibid., 55-57), he made no reference to Num 35,33-34, and found in Num 31,19 little more than a general analogy to the Chronicles texts.

context. Many instances of the expression concentrate on its moral-legal character as a heinous offence against God and humanity, but a significant number focus on religious aspects of שפך דם⁽³²⁾. Num 35,33-34, where alone the specific expression שפך דם occurs in Num 35, climaxes a longer section that sets out religio-legal prescriptions for dealing with homicide in the community (35,16-32). According to Num 35,33, when the crime specified as שפך דם has taken place it pollutes (יחניף) 'the land' (in the religious sense of both terms), and the community must take steps to deal with that pollution. The fundamental operative principle, stated in Num 35,33b, is that it is the shedding of the bloodshedder's own blood that removes the pollution (שפך דם אשר שפך-בה כדאם בדם שפכו) [35,33b]).

The general principle enunciated here also governs the series of preceding prescriptions covering homicide in the community. Thus the perpetrator of an intentional homicide that is adequately corroborated by witnesses is to be put to death, with no possibility of ransom and no recourse to a city of refuge (Num 35,15-21.30-31). In accord with the principle of Num 35,33b the shedding of the perpetrator's blood removes the pollution of the victim's blood. But nor can there be any ransom to free an unintentional homicide from his city of refuge before the death of the high priest (35,32). Violation of this rule would bring back upon 'the land' the pollution of the blood that was shed (35,33a) and thus render the unintentional homicide subject to the principle that his blood must be shed to remove that pollution (35,33b with 35,26-28). Hence the city of refuge serves both to quarantine from the community ('the land') the religious contagion that inheres in shed blood, even blood shed unintentionally, and to protect the unintentional homicide from the vengeance of the נאל הדם automatically set in motion by the fundamental religious principle (35,22-28 with 35,33b). That this is not in the end merely a matter of impersonal and inexorable religious laws, however, is affirmed in the passage's concluding statement (Num 35,34), where it is made clear that the overriding consideration is that 'the land' that would be religiously polluted by

⁽³²⁾ Besides Num 35 discussed here, cf. in particular Deut 19,10 with 21,1-9; Ezek 22,4 and 24,7 in the context of 24,6-13, especially 13; Ezek 36,18 in the context of 36,16-32; Ps 106,38-39. Hence DIRKSEN's claim, "Why was David Disqualified", 52, that 'elsewhere [*scil.* than in Chronicles] in the Old Testament the shedding of blood is not a cultic misstep, but an ethical transgression', is not only factually wrong, but also poses a misleading dichotomy, since quite clearly both elements are present in the above-cited passages.

failure to treat שֹׁפֵךְ דָּם according to the preceding prescriptions is 'the land' where YHWH dwells among his people⁽³³⁾.

From the foregoing we can now see how Num 35,33-34 impinges upon concerns central to Chronicles' account of the building of the temple. The fact that שֹׁפֵךְ דָּם entails a religious pollution that banishes the presence of YHWH from his land and his people would make it absolutely imperative that such an offence should not be built as it were into the very foundations of the building that is supremely to manifest YHWH's presence among his people⁽³⁴⁾. Moreover, we can also see how just this same passage, Num 35,33-34, provides a context to explicate the phrase אֶרֶצָה לִפְנֵי ('on the ground before me' [22,8by]) appended by YHWH to his charge that David shed blood⁽³⁵⁾. With this as background what the phrase articulates is the crucial fact that David's alleged bloodshedding is a religious offence that pollutes the land and outrages YHWH's presence there⁽³⁶⁾.

But what this text cannot yet explain is how the Chronicler associated שֹׁפֵךְ דָּם with killing in battle. For all of the details in Num 35,16-32 that instruct the congregation on how to proceed as between intentional and unintentional homicides manifestly apply to civil, not military, killings. But earlier in Numbers killing in battle is treated, uniquely in the Hebrew Bible, as ritually defiling, making the defiled a danger to the community ('the camp') until they have been decontaminated (31,19-24)⁽³⁷⁾. Whilst the expression שֹׁפֵךְ דָּם is not used in

⁽³³⁾ Cf. also Jer 7,6, where שֹׁפֵךְ דָּם is aligned with oppression of the weak and worship of other gods as sins whose elimination from Jerusalem would ensure YHWH dwelt in the land for ever (למךְ עוֹלָם וְעַד עוֹלָם) (Jer 7,7).

⁽³⁴⁾ On this see further the second paragraph on p. 472.

⁽³⁵⁾ I learn from KELLY, "David's Disqualification", 59, that this connection has already been made by I. GABRIEL, *Friede über Israel. Eine Untersuchung zur Friedenstheologie in Chronik I 10 – II 36* (ÖBS 10; Klosterneuberg 1990) 72. I have not had access to this study.

⁽³⁶⁾ WILLIAMSON, *1 & 2 Chronicles*, 154, commenting on 'before me upon the earth' (*sic*) in 1 Chr 22,8, correctly recognized that Chronicles charges David with a ritual offence that involved religious disqualification. Moreover, following Goettsberger, he sees that offence as in a general way analogous with those defined by the ritual regulations in Torah. My argument here gives that insight of Williamson a more precise focus, in that I show how the charge is in all probability drawn from explicit regulations in Numbers, regulations to which the phrase 'on the ground before me' is in fact one specific pointer.

⁽³⁷⁾ Dirksen's categorical assertion that 'in the Old Testament waging wars is not considered as making unclean' (DIRKSEN, "Why was David Disqualified", 52), although repeated approvingly by KELLY, "David's Disqualification", 54, is thus factually wrong.

Num 31,19-24, there are some terminological and conceptual links between Num 31,19-23 and Num 35,30-34 such as might have led the Chronicler to exegete the former in terms of the latter. Before we explore these links, however, we must first examine Num 31,19-24.

A decontamination ritual for warriors is specified by Moses in Num 31,19-20, to which the priest Eleazar adds a further detail in 31,24⁽³⁸⁾. Warriors who have killed (כל הרוג נפש) or had contact with a corpse (כל נגע בחלל [31,19b]) are to remain outside the camp for seven days, undergoing a purification ritual on the third and seventh days, and washing their clothes on the seventh (31,24). Though no form of either the verb חנק 'pollute' (Num 35,33) or טמא 'be defiled, contaminated' (Num 35,34) occurs in these verses, the verb טהר 'cleanse, purify' in 31,24, the semantic and ritual opposite to טמא, signals the successful completion of the ritual. The verb הטהר 'to decontaminate' used in 31,19.20 (and 31,23) also occurs in Num 19,12.13.20, but elsewhere in this sense only in Num 8,21. Moreover, the seven-day period of decontamination (so Num 19,11.16)⁽³⁹⁾, with purification rituals performed on the third and seventh days, using the 'water for purification' (מי נדה) as may be inferred from 31,23 (so Num 19,12-13.18-19), as well as the washing of the clothes on the seventh day (so Num 19,19), all link the ritual specified here closely with that specified for purification from corpse-contamination in Num 19,11-20, where forms of טמא occur some eight times (19,11.13.14.15.16.17.19.20)⁽⁴⁰⁾. So, notwithstanding the occasional

⁽³⁸⁾ The intervening verses, Num 19,21-23, deal with decontamination of elements of booty, an issue irrelevant to us here; but cf. above n. 6.

⁽³⁹⁾ D.P. WRIGHT, "Purification from Corpse-contamination in Numbers xxxi 19-24", *VT* 35 (1985) 215, n. 7, claims that Num 19, since it does not specify isolation outside the camp for corpse-contaminants, unlike Num 31,19 and 5,2-3, nor does it provide for their reentry into the camp after purification, 'appears to allow corpse-contaminated persons to remain in the camp'. But note that in 19,10 reentry into the camp after clothes washing was not specified for the person gathering the ashes of the red heifer, although, since that action is performed outside the camp (19,9), reentry must be implicated. Moreover, only one, final, reentry of the priest Eleazar is noted (19,7), although inferably he had earlier to return inside the camp, after slaughtering the sacrifice 'outside the camp' (19,3), to perform the blood ritual at the tent of meeting (19,4), and then to go out again. Hence I suspect that isolation outside the camp is simply taken as read in the ritual for corpse-decontamination in Num 19.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ On the relation to Num 19 see also WRIGHT, "Corpse-contamination", 214-215.

nature of its setting, following the revenge campaign against Midian (31,1-12), there is every reason to suppose that the ritual prescribed in Num 31,19-24 is intended as an *חֻק עולם* ('eternal statute' [Num 19,21], cf. *חֻק החוריה* [31,21]) parallel to that in Num 19, and that its purpose is the same, i.e. purification from corpse contamination⁽⁴¹⁾. But if the ritual is essentially the same and has the same end in view, why detail it separately here?

The answer surely lies in the difference between the circumstances of contamination. The law in Num 19, as the details in 19,14-18 indicate, applies to those contaminated by a corpse in civil life; the law in Num 31,19-24 to those so contaminated in a military situation⁽⁴²⁾. Consonant with this is a significant difference between the two prescriptions. Num 19 uses *כָּל-הַנֹּגֵעַ בּוֹ* '[everyone] who comes into contact with' a corpse (19,11.13 etc.), or *כָּל-הַבֹּא אֵלָיו* 'everyone who enters' or *כָּל-אֲשֶׁר בּוֹ* 'everyone who is in' the place where a corpse is (19,14), expressions that are all relatively intransitive. Num 31,19, however, leads with the transitive term *כָּל הַרֹג נֶפֶשׁ* 'everyone who kills somebody', to which it subjoins 'and everyone who touches a corpse' (*כָּל נֹגֵעַ בַּחֲלָל*). Moreover, the civil life prescriptions of Num 19, as also for those 'defiled by a corpse/human corpse' *טַמְאִים לְנֶפֶשׁ אָדָם/טַמְאָה לְנֶפֶשׁ* [Num 5,2b; 9,6.7.10; cf. 19,13]), do not specify the case of *כָּל הַרֹג נֶפֶשׁ* since they do not encompass it, as in civil life such a case would come under the rules applying to *דָּם* *שֶׁפַךְ דָּם* (Num 35,15-34). But nor on the other hand does Num 31,19 reckon the *כָּל הַרֹג נֶפֶשׁ* in battle as a *דָּם שֶׁפַךְ דָּם*, but only as one contaminated by a corpse in war, whom the specified ritual will purify, just as its equivalent in Num 19 purifies the civilian.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Similarly WRIGHT, "Corpse-contamination", 220-221, who rightly demurs from de Vaux's view that the ritual is a desacralization of warriors engaged in 'holy war' (R. DE VAUX, *Ancient Israel. Its Life and Institutions* [London 1961] 461).

⁽⁴²⁾ WRIGHT, "Corpse-contamination", 215, notes in passing this extension to 'soldiers returning from war', without remarking the uniqueness of this. Perhaps it arises as an extension of the specification of *חֲלָל-חֶרֶב* in Num 19,16 as a possible source of contamination. Whilst this might simply refer to one possible mode of killing in civil life, it can also be read as referring to the corpse of one killed in battle, with which a civilian may subsequently come into contact. The extension of this polluting contact to the warrior responsible for the killing is then not so great a step. *חֲלָל חֶרֶב* in reference to those killed in battle is frequent in prophetic texts: see e.g. Isa 22,2; Ezek 32,20-32 etc.

IV. David the warrior as שפך דם in Chronicles

If the discussion in the preceding section has helped us towards sorting out prescriptions in Num 19 and 31 about corpse contamination, and in Num 35 about שפך דם, it does not yet appear how it has advanced our understanding of the two Chronicles texts from which we started our investigation. Yet the key to the latter lies, I believe, in the Numbers passages I have cited above, principally Num 31 and 35, but also Num 5 and 19. Num 31,19-24 links כל הרג נפש in battle with corpse contamination, and that contamination excludes the warrior from the camp until he is purified. Similarly, exclusion from the camp is prescribed for the corpse contaminant (among others) in Num 5,2, but here it is motivated by the injunction

ולא יטמאו את־מחניהם אשר אני שכן בתוכם

... they shall not contaminate their camp where *I dwell in their midst* (Num 5,3b).

Although Num 19 does not explicitly prescribe exclusion from the camp for corpse-contaminants⁽⁴³⁾, anyone so contaminated who does not undergo the ritual of purification contaminates YHWH's tabernacle or 'dwelling-place' ידוה־משכן [19,13aα.20b]; note the emphasizing inversion in both instances) which, according to Num 2,2.17, is in the centre of the camp. Hence such assertions indicate that the principal concern of the prescriptions in Num 19, no less than of those in Num 5,2-3 where exclusion is explicitly prescribed, is to maintain or to restore a state of holiness conducive to the continued presence of YHWH in the midst of his people.

Now for Numbers and Chronicles both, the presence of YHWH in the midst of his people is supremely focused on the ark. Thus the liturgy of the ark in Num 10,35-36 is reflected at the end of the temple dedication in 2 Chr 6,41⁽⁴⁴⁾, where Solomon invokes YHWH and his ark to enter upon his rest (ועתה קומה ידוה אלהים לנוחך [2 Chr 6,41aα]) in 'this place' המקום הזה [6,40b]). But whereas in Numbers YHWH's resting-place מנוחה [Num 10,33]) was the shifting wilderness camp (מחנה [Num 10,34]) of the 'myriad contingents of Israel' (רבבות אלפי ישראל) [Num 10,36]), 'this place' in 1 Chr 6,40b is none

⁽⁴³⁾ But for reasons to suspect it may be implicated in the context, see n. 39 above.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Of course there is no doubt that 2 Chr 6,41 invokes Num 10,35-36 through Ps 132,8, but the form לנוחך in 2 Chr 6,41, not למנוחתך as in Ps 132,8, may reflect ובנוחה from Num 10,36.

other than 'the house of rest for the ark of YHWH's covenant' (other than *בית מנוחה לארון ברית-יהוה*) [1 Chr 28;2bα] that David planned to build, the very house YHWH prevented David from building because as a warrior he had shed blood (*כי איש מלחמות אתה ודמים שפכת*) [28,3b].

To understand why YHWH prevented David from building we need the last piece of our jigsaw-style argument, the middle term through which the Chronicler linked the *הרג נפש* of Num 31,19 with the *שפך דם* of Num 35,33. We saw above that, as the rituals for corpse contamination were motivated by reference to YHWH's presence among his people, the rules concerning the *שפך דם* in Num 35 were similarly motivated:

ולא תשמא את-הארץ אשר אחם ישיבים בה אשר אני שכן בחוכה כי אני יהוה שכן בתוך בני ישראל
(Num 35,34).

But in detailing these rules Num 35,30 uses the expression *שפך דם* 'everyone who strikes someone dead' to define the *כל-מכה-נפש*, an expression which semantically is essentially equivalent to *שפך דם* 'everyone who kills someone' used in Num 31,19 of the warrior who incurs corpse contamination⁽⁴⁵⁾. Accordingly Chronicles identified *שפך דם* with *כל-מכה-נפש* and thus with the *הרג נפש* of Num 35,33, by a syllogistic form of argument not unlike, though rather looser than, the later Rabbinic *g'zērā šāvā*. That is how the Chronicler saw David's involvement in war as warranting the charge of *שפך דם* in 1 Chr 22,8; 28,3.

Why just this charge disqualifies David from building the temple is then clear from Num 35,34, where the *שפך דם* contaminates the land where YHWH dwells among his people. Hence Chronicles finds against a David who, as a *הרג נפש* in battle, necessarily incurs the contamination of *שפך דם*, a ritual objection to his building for YHWH the 'house of rest', chosen and consecrated 'so that my name may be there in perpetuity' (2 Chr 7,16). This objection is highly appropriate for YHWH to make, and one that is commensurate with the enormity of the fact that YHWH thus prevents the great David from fulfilling what was otherwise the highly commendable desire of his heart (2 Chr 6,8). Moreover, on this account David's offence is no mere private offence against YHWH, but one that patently also involves the interests of the community as a whole. For if one accepts that for Chronicles the

⁽⁴⁵⁾ The verb *נכה* hiphil is very frequent of slaughter in battle: so e.g. 2 Sam 2,31; 5.20.24.25 etc.

temple is the divinely-appointed locus for the religious praxis that is the essence and vitality of Israel as the people of YHWH⁽⁴⁶⁾, it becomes clear why in Chronicles David's ritual disqualification from building is made a matter of public knowledge.

V. Concluding Observations

This attempt to explain how and why Chronicles charges David with *שפך דם* naturally has had to work with a host of presuppositions which time and space do not allow us to raise here. There are three further issues, however, on which I will add some brief remarks. First of all, my argument presumes the Chronicler's acquaintance with Num 31 and 35. Whilst, as indicated earlier, this has reasonable probability, given the general evidence for Chronicles' acquaintance with material in our book of Numbers, I can cite here evidence of an explicit connection between Num 31 and another text in Chronicles. In Num 31,6 the priest Phinehas takes *הַצְצֵרוֹת הַתְּרוּעָה* 'the trumpets for ritual alarm' into the battle against Midian. The only other occurrence of this expression in the whole of the Hebrew Bible is in Chronicles, when Abijah uses it of instruments blown by priests to begin a battle (*הַצְצֵרוֹת הַתְּרוּעָה* [2 Chr 13,12]). Moreover, these same texts, together with the similar Num 10,9, and 2 Chr 13,14, are the only texts that refer to the use of *הַצְצֵרוֹת* in war⁽⁴⁷⁾. The strong probability, therefore, that 2 Chr 13,12 depends on Num 31,6 notably strengthens the probability of the Chronicler knowing Num 31,19-24, and also, a little more weakly, that of his being acquainted with Num 35 also.

The second issue concerns the limits of the Chronicler's application of the charge of *שפך דם* to David as warrior. These limits are determined by the Chronicler's sole purpose of adequately explaining why YHWH disqualified David from building the temple. Num 35,33-34 uses the religious-ceremonial dimension of *שפך דם* as contamination to sanction a preceding set of legal proceedings in cases of civil homicide that are designed to eliminate or quarantine the associated bloodguilt from the community. It seems quite unlikely,

⁽⁴⁶⁾ On this see further D.F. MURRAY, "Retribution and Revival: Theological Theory, Religious Praxis, and the Future in Chronicles", *JSOT* 88 (2000) 77-99.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Num 31,6 probably reflects the prescription in Num 10,9 (*וַיִּדְרְעֵם בַּחֲצֹצְרוֹת*). Note that in Israel's religiously ceremonial 'siege' of Jericho the priests blow *שָׁפִירִים* (Josh 6,4 *et passim*), the normal instrument of signal in war, not *הַצְצֵרוֹת*.

however, that Chronicles intends to suggest that David's שפך דם in war has made him legally or morally culpable. If correctly attributed to the Chronicler, the equation הרג נפש (Num 31,19) = מכה נפש (Num 35,30) = שפך דם (Num 35,33) is used exclusively to devolve the same automatic religious consequence upon one designated by the first term as devolves upon one designated by (the middle and) the last, i.e. contamination of the place where YHWH dwells (Num 35,34). It is this ritual contamination that disqualifies David from building YHWH's house of rest. Nor, on my account of the Chronicler's reasoning, is this in any way incompatible with the clear representation of Chronicles that David's wars were divinely ordered and blessed⁽⁴⁸⁾, since in Num 31 such a divinely ordered (31,1.7) and blessed (31,8-12) battle results precisely in religious contamination (31,19-24)!

Finally, assuming that I have more or less correctly identified a line of argument that can reasonably be attributed to the Chronicler, why he did not simply assume that David, as הרג נפש in war, was ritually decontaminated in the way prescribed by Num 31,19-24 needs some explanation. On the one hand, the uniqueness for the Chronicler of the temple as *the* locus for the presence of YHWH among his people would demand a unique degree of ritual purity from its would-be builder, as witness the portrayal of a Solomon unsullied in his devotion to YHWH as the actual builder. Thus the Chronicler may well have been troubled by the absence of any account of such decontamination of David. But on the other hand, YHWH's marked insistence in 1 Chr 22,8 on David's shedding 'copious blood' from his involvement in 'great wars' points to an unusual degree of ritual defilement, a degree to which the ritual of decontamination could reasonably appear inadequate. Hence for Chronicles David's unusual degree of ritual defilement is in irresolvable tension with the demand for a unique degree of ritual purity in the temple-builder. In the end the Chronicler was faced with the recalcitrance of two imperatives not easy to reconcile: on the one hand, his own ideological view that YHWH had assigned David a leading role in preparing for the temple; on the other, the strength of the received tradition that not David but Solomon actually built it. The issue is not whether the preceding explanation would satisfy us

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Against the assertion of such an incompatibility by both DIRKSEN, "Why was David Disqualified", 51, and KELLY, "David's Disqualification", 54. For the divine ordering and blessing of David's wars in Chronicles, compare in particular how David's successful bringing up of the ark to Jerusalem (1 Chr 15,1-16,43) immediately follows his victories against the Philistines (1 Chr 14,8-17).

moderns who demand a more stringent logic, but whether it would have satisfied the Chronicler. A propos of that, it is worth noting that YHWH's analogous prohibition of Moses, the model for David in Chronicles, from entering the Promised Land is no more perspicuously or convincingly explained in the Hebrew Bible.

In sum, then, the preceding argument has marshalled evidence from which I conclude that:

1) in Chronicles the charge of שפך דם is uniquely made against David;

2) this charge in 1 Chr 22,8; 28,3 is explicitly tied to David's killing in war;

3) in the Hebrew Bible such a charge against an Israelite warrior is unique to Chronicles;

4) hence for YHWH so to charge David, in Chronicles of all texts, is astounding;

5) but a persuasive basis for the charge can be derived from linking the הרג נפש in Num 31,19 with the שפך דם in Num 35,33-34, through the מכה הנפש in 35,30 as the middle term;

6) such an exegetical move fits both the general evidence for the influence of Numbers on Chronicles, and the explicit link between ארצה לפני in one of our texts (1 Chr 22,8) and Num 35,33-34;

7) the basic concern in these Numbers passages, namely to ensure that no Israelite brings religious contamination into proximity with YHWH so as to drive his presence from among his people, fits both the general ideology of Chronicles, and the concerns of our passages in particular.

University of Exeter
Queen's Building
The Queen's Drive
Exeter EX44QH (UK)

Donald F. MURRAY

SUMMARY

As grounds for YHWH's veto on David's building the temple, the charge of shedding blood, in Chronicles made against David alone (1 Chr 22,8; 28,3), poses questions both about what is being referred to, and how the charge explains the veto, given that in the Hebrew Bible no other Israelite warrior incurs the charge for killing in warfare. This article explicates the charge, highlights how surprising it is, and then develops a line of argument, drawn principally from Num 31 and 35, that can explain how the Chronicler understood the charge both to be warranted, and to justify YHWH's veto.

From Jezebel to Esther: Fashioning Images of Queenship in the Hebrew Bible

Whatever else had inspired the recording of the translation of a chaste and beautiful Jewish woman from her cousin's home to the harem of a gentile king, the fact remains that there were few biblical antecedents to chart Esther's progress through a palatial phase. Much has been written about the stereotype of the Jewish courtier in a foreign court but the image of Joseph constitutes a poor source of inspiration for that of a Jewish queen attempting to exert power from a royal bedchamber. There are, in fact, few narratives in the HB that focus on the critical activities generated in the intimacy of royal marriage. Of these, the episodes centering on Jezebel and Ahab provide comprehensive glimpses at a royal bedroom and at its intricacies⁽¹⁾.

At the heart of this study stands the hypothesis that the story of Esther and Ahasuerus must be read as a rehabilitative narrative of the tale of Jezebel and Ahab. To be exact, the narrative of Esther, if read sensibly and sensitively, bears unmistakable allusions to that of Jezebel. Both share an ideological kinship that aspires to define the desired characteristics and behavior of Israelite/Jewish queens.

An investigation into the use of Jezebel as a shadowy foil to Esther highlights biblical (redactional) ideas regarding queenly images, queenly spheres of influence and the molding of 'Israelite'/Jewish queens⁽²⁾. Underlying both narratives, ultimately, is a condemnation of Israelite/Jewish monarchy. Such a theory can also account, in part, for some of the striking omissions of the 'exilic' Esther narrative, not the least the absence of prophets and the failure to refer explicitly to God. To illustrate these points in full I will also institute comparisons with

(1) Besides these two only 1 Kgs 1 deals with a crucial bedroom scene. But Bathsheba is first and foremost a mother and not a wife. On queen-mothers as arbiters of royal succession see H. ZLOTNICK, "Securing the Succession: Mothers and Prophets in 1 Kgs 1" (forthcoming).

(2) C. SMITH, "'Queenship' in Israel: The cases of Bathsheba, Jezebel and Athaliah", *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. J. DAY) (JSOTSS 270; Sheffield 1998) 142-162, on the absence of the concept in the HB and on the queen-mother as the dominant female character at court. Jezebel, however, is not a queen-mother, nor is Esther. Moreover, the only child whose rights Jezebel may have advanced is a daughter rather than a son.

early Roman queens. Cross-cultural parallels of this sort have the potential of contributing to fuller understanding of Jewish (and Roman) reconstructions of the monarchic past as a tissue of familial narratives focusing on the reputation or notoriety of female protagonists.

I. The Royal Wife: Queens as Protagonists

Jezebel is remembered, above all, for her role in the famed episode of the vineyard of Naboth (1 Kgs 21)⁽³⁾. The story begins with direct negotiations between two men, a king and his subject, Ahab and Naboth, over the legal acquisition of a plot of land adjacent to a royal residence. The exchange is terminated with Naboth's insistence on the inalienable character of his property. His refusal to comply with the king's desire leaves Ahab with two options: he can abandon his rosy visions of a palatial garden (21,2) or he can exert his authority to prevail, by hook and by crook, over the scruples and the objections of Naboth. The king chooses neither. Returning home from his unprofitable dialogue with Naboth he retires to his bedchamber in a foul mood and plunges into a fast⁽⁴⁾.

As the scene shifts from the outside with its vineyards and hypothetical gardens to the royal bedroom the queen enters the picture. Her 'credentials' had already been established. Readers had been familiarized with this Sidonian princess as the moving spirit behind her husband's devotion to the Baal (16,31), and as the mortal enemy of YHWH's prophets (18,4.13)⁽⁵⁾. The fact that Ahab's marriage with her

⁽³⁾ R. BOHLEN, *Der Fall Naboth*. Form, Hintergrund und Werdegang einer alttestamentlichen Erzählung (1 Kön 21) (TThSt 35; Trier 1978), for full analysis. On the three stages of composition/redaction ('original', Dtr expansion, and exilic elaboration), W.M. SCHNIEDEWIND, "History and Interpretation: The Religion of Ahab and Manasseh in the Book of Kings", *CBQ* 55 (1993) 649-661, esp. 655. On scholarly controversies regarding the layering of 1 Kgs 21 see R. MARTIN-ACHARD, "La vigne de Naboth (1 Rois 21) d'après des études récentes", *ETR* 66 (1991) 1-16, and standard commentaries, including J. GRAY, *I & II Kings*. A Commentary (OTL; London 1970); G.H. JONES, *1 and 2 Kings* (NCBC; Grand Rapids 1984); J.T. WALSH, *1 Kings* (Berit Olam; 1996); and T.E. FRETHEIM, *First and Second Kings* (Westminster Bible Companion; Louisville 1999).

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. 1 Kgs 20,43, a redactional bridging touch, which uses the same expression to describe Ahab's reaction to YHWH's chiding.

⁽⁵⁾ On the hostility of the D theologians to Jezebel and her religious affiliation, P. TRIBLE, "Exegesis for Storytellers and Other Strangers", *JBL* 114 (1995) 3-19, esp. 4 and *passim*.

also signaled the acceptance of the Omrides by their neighbors was deemed irrelevant by the biblical redactor. Yet, with the exception of Solomon, only Ahab achieved the kind of 'international' status that made him a desirable match in the eyes of neighboring kings.

Jezebel's intrusion into Ahab's self-imposed solitude re-enacts the tale of the vineyard verbally and in the intimacy of the royal bedroom. Within this familial context Jezebel emerges as the king's solicitous spouse rather than as a bearer of idolatry. Her question, 'What is the matter with you and why are you not eating' (1 Kgs 21,5), supports this image. Ahab replies with a distorted version of the words exchanged with Naboth. According to his presentation Naboth was guilty of obstinacy if not of disobedience through an unreasonable refusal of complying with the king's seemingly reasonable request.

On the surface, this brief and rare glimpse into a royal marriage reveals a model of spousal relations and an inordinate degree of marital harmony and trust⁽⁶⁾. Ahab admits his weakness to a sympathetic wife expecting, presumably, support and understanding. She expresses perhaps indignation perhaps surprise and promises the fulfillment of his desires. He refrains from probing her promise. Even before this bedroom snapshot the text refers to the couple's closeness and her status, in spite of Ahab's other wives. He shares with her not only her gods but also information about the management of the kingdom, including the difficulties attendant on the maintenance of correct relations with YHWH's prophet, Elijah (1 Kgs 19,1). She issues a death threat to Elijah that effectively undermines Ahab's conciliatory politics and demonstrates her standing at the court.

How extraordinary was the association of an 'Israelite' queen, even of foreign descent, with unlimited accessibility to the king can be fully appreciated through the fashioning of royal intimacy in the scroll of Esther⁽⁷⁾. Only three royal couples in the HB, Jezebel and Ahab, Esther and Ahasuerus, David and Bathsheba, are seen, or rather heard in direct verbal communication. But the nature of Bathsheba's intercession is dictated by motherly and not by wifely concerns. Her

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. Proverbs' ideal wife (Prov 31,11-12 (trust of husband; rewarding husband with good and not with evil deeds) and 31,16-17 (plotting to obtain a field and to plant a vineyard!)).

⁽⁷⁾ Since Jezebel's 'foreignness' was clearly irrelevant in the determination of royal succession, she can be regarded as 'Israelite' for all intents and purposes. On Esther see my analysis in H. ZLOTNICK, *Dinah's Daughters. Gender and Judaism from the Hebrew Bible to Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia 2001 [in print]).

appearance in the king's bedroom, where another woman had been occupying the king's bed, is carefully orchestrated by a prophet. She is neither Jezebel nor Esther.

Like Jezebel, Esther is one of many royal consorts. Unlike Jezebel, when Esther approaches her royal husband she is not only afraid of the consequences of appearing without summons but she also behaves as a humble petitioner rather than a royal consort (Esth 4,11). Even in the privacy of her own rooms Esther has to tread carefully. After obtaining permission to stage a private banquet for the king and a favorite minister (Haman) she dares not bring up her grievance before plying Ahasuerus with drinks (Esth 7,1.2.7). And even then she waits till Ahasuerus seeks enlightenment regarding the identity of the author of the anti-Jewish measures in his kingdom.

When Esther exposes Haman Ahasuerus, like Ahab, retires in anger not to his bedroom but rather to an adjacent garden. That the scroll conjures up for the king's inflamed spirit the exact same soothing landscape that Ahab had desired to create out of Naboth's vineyard seems hardly a coincidence. Ahasuerus' brief stroll in the queen's garden is staged as a prelude to the climax of the plot and marks the end of Haman's career. Ahab's urge to enlarge the palace's garden sets in motion a series of crimes and signals the demise of his dynasty.

Both the Dtr historian (= the redactor of 1 Kgs 21) and the author of the scroll cloth with mockery the marriages they delineate. The former casts the king's bedroom as a launching pad for queenly crimes; the latter places the queen in bed with her enemy rather than with her lawful consort. In both narratives communications between king and queen, although direct, are marked by evasions and half-truths. Ahab and Jezebel communicate through deceptions. He provides an edited version of his dealings with Naboth while she avoids further delving into both his statements and her own strategies. Esther hides her true identity from Ahasuerus when she joins the harem. She also conceals her true intention from him when she solicits permission to hold a private banquet for Haman. If Ahasuerus believed his beautiful wife, a rather doubtful proposition, he elected to humor her by pretending ignorance.

An interplay between the words and the actions of the protagonists further reveals parallels between the tales of Jezebel and Esther. Jezebel reminds Ahab of his royal status only to undermine her own assertion by assuming kingly power. Mordechai, ostensibly a caring

relative, reminds Esther of her position at the court solely to prompt her to use it in spite of danger to her life in obeying his order. Neither Ahab nor Esther, of course, requires the admonition. But the reminders also imply an admission of Mordechai's own helplessness and of Ahab's inability to deal with the situation. As the action shifts into the hands of the two queens the scroll is still careful to entrust the initial urging into the hands of a male relative, thereby 'correcting' the Dtr history that had cast Jezebel as the prompter and the actor.

A choice of seminal gestures and phrases in the scroll's description of critical preliminaries appears to recall, somewhat perversely but accurately, the earlier narrative. When Esther hears that Mordechai has been seen donning mourning clothes at the gate of the palace she orders an inquiry into this seemingly inexplicable and apparently inexcusable public display (Esth 4,1-5). Jezebel addresses her grief-stricken and fasting spouse in a similar mode, likewise implying that his behavior is uncalled for. At the heart of the familial encounters on the eve of a crisis are two difficult phrases that emphasize the addressee's status. 'Who knows? Perhaps you have attained royalty for just such a time as this?' (Esth 4,14) (*). Jezebel addresses Ahab with a similarly pregnant question: 'Do you now govern Israel?' (1 Kgs 21,7). In both instances a rhetoric of timeliness is intended to spur the protagonists to action. Mordechai succeeds in coercing Esther to act; Jezebel becomes an actor rather than a prompter.

Structurally, the later narrative also encodes the making of Esther as a queen in a sequence that echoes Jezebel's queenly progress. In the wake of the fateful exchange between Esther and Mordechai Esther, like Jezebel after her interchange with Ahab, appropriates control over the course of events. She issues an order to summon the Jews of Susa for a three-day fast (Esth 4,16). In the reconstructed order of events in 1 Kgs 21 Jezebel acts along precisely the same lines: she summons the council of the elders in Naboth's town and calls for a fast (21,9). In both cases the queen effectively transfers the gestures (fasting; mourning) that launch fatal encounters between kin (Ahab/Jezebel; Mordechai/Esther) to a wider circle of the public, thereby opening the door to an outbreak or a resolution of a crisis.

(*) My translation is based on J.W.H. VAN WIJK-BOS, *Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther* (Westminster Bible Companion; Louisville 1998) but see the comments of Paton in his invaluable commentary on possible corruption and on the elusive structure and meaning of this phrase.

Lest, however, these close analogies inspire unwary readers with either sympathy towards Jezebel or hostility to Esther, the latter narrator carefully parts the ways of the two queens. Jezebel disappears, physically, from subsequent proceedings. Her invisible presence, however, is constantly referred to in the text. By contrast, Esther appears in all her regal splendor in the inner palace court as she implements the first part of her plan to save the Jews from extinction. She is fully visible, unlike Jezebel, but her intentions are concealed from the beholder. Esther is also beautiful, a familiar attribute of matriarchs in the HB. Jezebel lacks a face and a figure, as though she is made of an evil spirit alone. Moreover, readers are aware of Jezebel's aim from the start as she sets out to fulfil her husband's wish. Her method of achieving it soon becomes apparent. In the scroll neither husband nor its readers are familiarized with Esther's schemes to deliver her promise.

II. The Two Faces of Queenship

Casting an Esther as a Jezebel carried, potentially, dangerous connotations. The hostility of biblical narrators to queens who, like Jezebel, usurp the role of kings in a manner that highlights the limitations of kingly power and the breakdown of male authority within the home is undisguised. It finds an amplified echo in the annals of the early Roman monarchy (6th century BCE) which chart the career of two queens, Tanaquil and Tullia, who bear curious similarities to the biblical female monarchs. Because Roman authors are considerably more expansive than biblical narrators they provide valuable insights into the process that molded queenly images in antiquity.

In the hindsight of several centuries, the history of early Rome emerges in the pages of the historian Livy (57-14 BCE) as a family narrative dominated by the ambitions of its female members and punctuated by their sense of honor and shame⁽⁹⁾. Of these, Tullia, like Jezebel, is a daughter of a king (Servius Tullius). Her husband, Tarquinius (Superbus), is likewise a son of a monarch (Tarquinius Priscus) who, however, had designated another man, a non-relative, as his successor. To win the stakes in the complicated game of succession

(9) My comments are based on C.G. CALHOON, "Lucretia, Savior and Scapegoat: The Dynamics of Sacrifice in Livy 1.57-59", *Helios* 24 (1997) 151-169.

the couple embarks on a career of crimes, including the murder of their first respective spouses and the killing of Tullia's father, the reigning ruler. Although apparently a match made in heaven, Livy shows no hesitation in casting Tullia as the moving spirit behind the rocky ride to the throne of Rome.

Echoing what Jezebel might have said to Ahab, had the text been recorded and transmitted in full, Tullia addresses her husband as follows:

If you are the man I thought I was marrying, then show yourself to be a man and a king. If not ... you have compounded a crime with cowardice. What is the matter with you? You are not from Corinth or from Tarquinii, like your father, nor is it necessary for you to make yourself a king in a foreign land. The gods of your family, your ancestors, the image of your father, the royal palace, its throne and the very name Tarquinius make and proclaim you king. Why else, if your spirit is too mean to (undertake) this, do you deceive the city? Why do you allow yourself to be looked upon as a prince? Depart to Taquinii or Corinth where you can sink once more into oblivion...⁽¹⁰⁾.

Focusing on the interaction between the family and the state as two social entities Livy shows how the privileging of the family interest at the expense of public duty generates chaos⁽¹¹⁾. Tullia and Tarquinius base their claim to the kingship on kinship alone, thus reversing and subverting the principle of merit and of inclusion on which the Roman royal succession had been established from the start. Jezebel 'vindicates' the king who is also her husband, thereby undermining the foundations of the royal system of dispensing justice.

In Livy's landscape of early Rome the palace is the focus and the symbol of the couple's unbridled ambitions. From the seclusion of their domestic space Tullia and Tarquinius launch their criminal activities. When Tarquinius appears in the curia (= senate house) with an armed bodyguard, Tullia burst on the scene and hails him as king. Her action and gesture constitute a double transgression. Not only does she violate the physical boundaries of males' space by intruding into male business in the forum, but she also crosses the frontiers of male authority by being the first to confer royalty on a man in public.

Responding to censure, not the least from her own husband, Tullia

⁽¹⁰⁾ Titus Livius, *Ab urbe condita* 1.47.3-5. Trans.: Titus Livius, *Opera*. With an English translation by B.O. Foster et al. (LCL 114; Cambridge 1988 [1919]) 165, modified.

⁽¹¹⁾ A. FELDHER, *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History* (Berkeley 1998) 190.

defends herself by appealing to another queenly model. She regards herself as a faithful imitator, if not an improved version of Tanaquil, her mother-in-law who had been instrumental in helping her own husband (Tarquinius Priscus) to become a king at Rome, and who had ensured the smooth transfer of power to a successor she herself had chosen (Servius Tullius, Tullia's father).

Livy's presentation of Tanaquil is ambiguous. In his words, she is 'a woman of the most exalted birth and not of a character lightly to endure a humbler rank in her new [Roman] environment than the one she had enjoyed by birth' ⁽¹²⁾. To save the monarchy Tanaquil alters the deliberative process reserved for the senate and the people of Rome. When her husband falls victim to an assassination plot, she encourages Servius to take the reigns into his hands:

To you, Servius, if you are a man, belongs this kingdom, not to those who by the hands of others have committed a dastardly crime. Arouse yourself and follow the guidance of the gods ... Now is the time ... Rise up to the occasion. We, too, although foreigners, ruled over Rome. Consider who you are and not where you were born. If your judgement is numb in so sudden a crisis then follow my council ⁽¹³⁾.

The fact that Livy leaves the ultimate tribute to Tanaquil in Tullia's hands reflects a deep-seated uneasiness with the assumption of male power by women, laudable as their intentions and ultimate results might have been. Although Tanaquil's resourcefulness saves the dynasty that she had created she also violates male norms by claiming a higher authority than the traditional *mos maiorum* (custom) would have allowed any woman, queens included. By setting herself and her late husband as models for Tullius to be imitated, Tanaquil also paves the way to Tullia.

As the biblical narrative recreates Jewish queenship in the scroll of Esther, the leading female character undergoes the same kind of transformation that underlies the Tanaquil-to-Tullia process, but in reverse. To begin with, Esther is not only Jewish but a woman with impeccable royal (Jewish) blood in her veins. Jezebel is constantly branded a foreigner in a manner that reflects not only her ethnicity but also her proclivities ⁽¹⁴⁾. In the redactional history of the Hebrew Bible

⁽¹²⁾ Titus Livius, *Ab urbe* 1.34.3 (Foster's translation, modified).

⁽¹³⁾ Ibid., 1.41.4 (Foster's translation, modified).

⁽¹⁴⁾ On the importance of the motif of Jezebel as the proverbial foreign woman, J.A. SOGGIN, "Jezebel oder die fremde Frau", *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (AOAT 212; Kevelaer 1981) 453-459.

the Deuteronomist antipathy to foreigners, and particularly to foreign queens, has been associated with a deep-seated fear of idolatry through contamination⁽¹⁵⁾. The elevation of foreigners to Rome's throne, by contrast, reflects Rome's greatness and her openness to strangers, while Tullia's urging of her husband to seize the throne on the ground of his 'nativeness' is clearly misplaced.

The scroll depicts the decree of Ahasuerus-Haman ordering the elimination of the Jews as a writ of national emergency. The clash between Ahab and Naboth appears, at first, as carrying little import beyond the king's petty desire to expand to plant vegetables. Yet behind the issue of the vineyard versus royal garden lurks the larger question of the legitimate scope of monarchical actions *vis-à-vis* the king's subjects⁽¹⁶⁾. In the Esther scroll the queen reacts to a patriarchal call to action and only exercises her potential royal power to save her people, as Tanaquil does to save Rome from revolution. Jezebel, like Tullia, acts on her own initiative, subverting male standards of royal behavior.

Just how perilously close to each other are, nevertheless, constructs of royal women like Tanaquil and Tullia on the one hand, and Jezebel and Esther on the other, can be further gauged from the attitude of all the texts to the public appearance of queens. Roman and Jewish authors are unanimous in banning women from the public eye. Jezebel and Esther never appear in public. Tanaquil makes a single public appearance when there is no one else who can save the dynasty. Even then she remains standing at a window in the palace, shielded by its walls. Tullia's venturing into the forum invokes censure by her husband, and by the historian Livy. But Tanaquil's position near a top window, although emphasizing Tullia's boldness in venturing outdoors, also signifies the female usurpation of male authority at home. Ultimately, both women embark on a course of action that contradicts male expectations of female royalty. Nevertheless Tanaquil garners praise while Tullia is condemned.

Jezebel's sole 'public' appearance is made as a spectator standing at the window of the palace that another king is about to possess. Observing the approach of Jehu, she stands at the window as a visual

⁽¹⁵⁾ G. KNOPPERS, "Sex, Religion and Politics: The Deuteronomist on Intermarriage", *HAR* (1994) 121-142.

⁽¹⁶⁾ On the king's role of ensuring justice throughout his kingdom, H. SCHULTE, "The End of the Omride Dynasty: Social-Ethical Observations on the Subject of Power and Violence", *Semeia* 66 (1994) 133-148, esp. 134.

reminder of the legitimacy of her royal position and of his usurpation. Her words reinforce the image that her presence conveys: 'Is it peace, Zimri, murderer of his master?' (2 Kgs 9,30). Her words, like Tanaquil's to Tullius, are filtered through space and the conventions of official language as she faces the successor of her dynasty and her ultimate executioner⁽¹⁷⁾.

Esther is never seen or heard addressing directly any man besides her husband and cousin/father. In fact, no biblical narrator or redactor ventured to place either queen, Jezebel or Esther, outside the confines of the palace itself. Both women use messengers to gather information and agents to convey their commands and their threats. Yet, like Tanaquil and Tullia, the two biblical queens were destined for vastly disparate 'after-life'. In collective memory Jezebel became a stereotype of shrewish and detestable queens⁽¹⁸⁾. Esther's adventures are still celebrated.

III. Naboth's Trial: Jezebel the Persecutor

Underlying Jezebel's assumption of royal authority in the case of Naboth is the pitting of her patron-god, the Baal, with the national Israelite divinity, YHWH. Within this context the queen's uncompromising loyalty to her husband, in itself a commendable wifely trait, is completely obscured. Esther is not even expected to display spousal loyalty to her royal husband but rather a commitment to her own community of origin. Her dilemma as a wife and a queen is staged as a predicament of the Jewish people as a whole. Ahab's reflects the king's own pettiness.

In the name of Ahab Jezebel communicates the king's alleged commands to the local authorities in Naboth's hometown. The redacted story does not explain whether she had been empowered to do so. It implies that she abused, rather than used the king's implicit trust in her⁽¹⁹⁾. In the scroll of Esther not a single person, wife or otherwise,

(17) CALHOON, "Lucretia, Savior and Scapegoat", 158 (on Tanaquil). On the heroic quality of Jezebel's last moments, P.D. ACKROYD, "Goddesses, Women and Jezebel", *Images of Women in Antiquity* (eds. A. CAMERON – A. KUERT) (London 1983) 245-249, esp. 246.

(18) Cf. J.L. NELSON, "Queens as Jezebels: The Careers of Brunhild and Balthild", *SCH(L)S* 1 (1978), 31-77.

(19) Note the absence of the title 'queen' in the narrative versus its ubiquitous use in the Esther narrative (Esth 2,22; 4,4; 5,2 and *passim*)

is allowed to issue royal commands without the king's explicit seal of approval. Jezebel acts on her own initiative and without the prompting of a male relative. In her eyes she is embarking on a just vindication of the injured royal dignity.

The theme of writing on behalf of the king, with or without explicit permission, and of using the royal seal to convey the legality of the message dominates both the Jezebel and the Esther accounts⁽²⁰⁾. 1 Kgs 21,8 depicts Jezebel as writing a royal letter to Naboth's peers by herself but in Ahab's name, and using his seal. She is thus engaged in a pursuit that is not only unacceptable when undertaken by men without duly conferred authority but is the height of impropriety when practiced by a woman. Yet, according to 1 Kgs 21,9 the letter merely contained a call for a local fast although the redacted sequence of the events strongly suggests that it also contained instructions regarding the staging of the whole affair.

Esther's sojourn at the court is marked from the very start by directions incorporated in written commands. She is joined to the harem upon the publication and dissemination of a royal order to gather beauties from all over the kingdom (Esth 2,8). Ahasuerus endorses Haman's request to eliminate the Jews with his own seal (= ring) (Esth 3,10) and the royal scribes articulate the command in a series of letters that they distribute (Esth 3,12-13). The fact that such orders had been issued in the name of the king and not of his minister is tacitly ignored by Esther when she pleads in front of Ahasuerus (Esth 7,4-6). The king's implicit or explicit permission is precisely the aspect that the redactor of the Naboth affair never lets the readers forget when he insists on the concealed authorship of Jezebel. Finally, to illustrate the changing fortunes of Haman, Ahasuerus allows Esther and Mordechai to issue in his name and with his seal commands relating to the fate of their enemies (Esth 8,8). According to the scroll's redactor, such royal orders, albeit not a royal initiative, nevertheless possess full legal validity and are irreversible (Esth 8,8).

In Livy's depictions of early Rome queens never resort to the use or the abuse of their proximity to the source of power through the issuance of written documents. Both Tanaquil and Tullia address the public directly and orally, without mediation. Livy evidently did not deem it necessary to clothe Tullia's illegal deeds with legitimacy

⁽²⁰⁾ M. BAL, "Lots of Writing", *Ruth and Esther* (ed. A. BRENNER) (A Feminist Companion to the Bible 3; Sheffield 1999) 212-238.

through the power of the written royal word. Her truly offensive transgression in Livy's eyes resided in the crossing of gender boundaries in public and not in secrecy. Casting Jezebel as a usurper of the king's authority through stealth reflects both the real limits of queenly power and the redactor's own biases. To rehabilitate this queenly image the scroll carefully invests Esther with direct royal authority to issue empire-wide commands in the king's name.

Without, evidently, Ahab's knowledge or permission Jezebel bids the leading men in Naboth's town to announce a public fast and to appoint Naboth to head this solemn occasion. No reason is given to account for the fast, nor is objection offered⁽²¹⁾. Perhaps the drought that had marked Ahab's reign provided the pretext. Unlike Naboth, his peers obey the royal desire without demure or protest⁽²²⁾. The fast, as in other biblical narratives, serves as a preliminary to a critical public occasion. In Neh 9,1 a fast precedes the ceremony of the renewal of the ancient covenant between YHWH and the exilic community in Yehud. In 1 Kgs 21 the fast is concluded with a judicial murder that signals the demise of the Omride dynasty. Throughout Persia the news of the decree ordering the execution of the Jews prompts a general fast (Esth 4,4). Like Jezebel, Esther calls for a fast as she prepares herself for what can become a fatal encounter with the king (Esth 4,16).

In the midst of the public fasting ceremony in Jezreel two unnamed men accuse Naboth of blaspheming God and king⁽²³⁾. The text makes no reference to the source of the accusation nor does it explicitly connect Jezebel with the two men. Their identity remains concealed. Yet, had they been non-entities their incriminating evidence may not have been accepted as promptly as it was. Jezebel's complicity is implied throughout. The charge of blasphemy is interesting. Lev 24

⁽²¹⁾ A. ROFÉ, "The Vineyard of Naboth: The Origin and Message of the Story", *VT* 38 (1988) 92, on the proclamation of fasts in times of national crisis. Cf. Elijah's summoning the people to put an end to the drought, E.K. HOLT, "'Urged on by his Wife Jezebel...' A literary Reading of 1 Kgs 18 in Context", *SJOT* 9 (1995) 85.

⁽²²⁾ Their behavior contrasts with the resistance to submission exhibited by the 'elders' whom Ahab had summoned to discuss Ben Hadad's demands (1 Kgs 20,7). On the expanding 'circle of guilt', J.T. WALSH, "Methods and Meanings: Multiple Studies of I Kings 21", *JBL* 111 (1992) 199, 201.

⁽²³⁾ On the legal aspects of the accusation, F.I. ANDERSEN, "Socio-Juridical Background of the Naboth Incident", *JBL* 85 (1966) 46-57, concluding that Naboth had actually promised to sell but reneged and that his refusal was presented at the 'trial' as a blasphemy justifying the forfeiture of his land by the intended buyer.

provides a precedent for the public stoning of a man who blasphemes God. However, the Pentateuchal tale focuses on a blasphemer who is half Israelite, half Egyptian, leaving open the question of the fate of a fully-fledged Israelite. There are no rules relating to procedure in the case of blaspheming a king⁽²⁴⁾. Nor is it clear if the charge against Naboth involved a public or private manifestation of disrespect. The two knaves testify that he had done so presumably within earshot.

What the redactional recording of the Jezreel proceedings leaves in no doubt is its 'reading' of the entire affair as a blasphemy. In this interpretative fashion the tale is launched with Naboth's (futile) appeal to YHWH. It continues with Ahab's (fruitful) entrusting the queen with a resolution, and ends with a fatal accusation of blasphemy. In the process, Jezebel, already cast as the persecutor of YHWH's prophets, is characterized as a prosecutor of YHWH's innocent worshipper⁽²⁵⁾.

The transformation of a private grievance (between Naboth and Ahab), through Jezebel, into a public charge becomes the dominant motif behind the scroll's recreation of the events that led to a 'judgement' (without trial) of the Jews of Persia. Originating as an encounter between two individuals, Haman and Mordechai, a private feud is turned into a public affair when Haman approaches Ahasuerus with accusations regarding the Jewish community of the Persian empire. Like Jezebel, Haman cannot broach the real object of his impeachment speech and, like her once more, he concocts a general charge that depicts the Jews as a subversive element in the kingdom. Presenting them as people who 'do not abide by the royal laws' (Esth 3,8) Haman, like Jezebel, initiates a legitimate action against an appointed victim. And once more like the queen who promises the delivery of Naboth's vineyard into Ahab's hands, Haman assures the king of substantial material rewards as a result of the anti-Jewish law.

⁽²⁴⁾ Assuming that the text separates between God and king, although it can also be taken as a standard formula linking the two. Exod 22,27, invoked by all commentators, merely prohibits the cursing of God and of מלך (king?) without imposing penalty. Nor are the verbs describing the banned action in Exod the same employed to describe Naboth's alleged crime. Supporting, indirectly, Rofé's assumption of a late (5–4 centuries BCE) date for the redaction of 1 Kgs 21 (ROFÉ, "Vineyard", 97–101).

⁽²⁵⁾ Hence the seemingly irrelevant appeal of Naboth to YHWH in the initial encounter between him and Ahab for no law prohibited the alienation of ancestral property. However, as FRETHEIM, *First and Second Kings*, 118, correctly emphasizes, priestly law (Lev 25,23) insists that all the land belonged to YHWH and, by implication, cannot be sold for any reason or in perpetuity.

While the Dtr historian has no interest in the effect of Jezebel's actions on the community of Naboth, Esther's author-redactor expands on the reactions of Jews and non-Jews to the publication of the king's commands. The only person who remains blissfully ignorant of the impending fate of the Jews is Esther herself, like Ahab who is also seemingly unaware of his wife's plans. When Elijah clarifies the situation for the king's benefit Ahab plunges into mourning (1 Kgs 21,27) in a manner recaptured by the scroll as it describes the general lamentation over the royal command (Esth 4,3). Ahab's remorseful fasting is sufficient to appease God, at least for the time being (1 Kgs 21,28) but does not prevent the ultimate demise of his dynasty. Ahasuerus' remorse brings fatality to Haman and salvation to his intended victims.

Now, the twin themes of fasting and feasting underlie both narratives⁽²⁶⁾. As Ahab starts a fast over his failure to acquire Naboth's property Jezebel encourages him to eat. But she herself, a generous provider of nourishment to hundreds of Baalistic prophets (1 Kgs 18,19), is destined to be eaten as food for dogs. Upon Elijah's disclosures of Naboth's execution Ahab expresses his repentance through another fast. Jezebel is never accredited with remorse. When Ahab dies on the battlefield (in royal terms an honorable death), a victim of his own ruse, his blood provides a drink to stray dogs. Ironically, then, the royal couple ends by feeding animals, she with her body and he with his blood. They remain united in infamy even after death.

Throughout Esther feasting and fasting highlight the changing conditions of individuals and of collectivities. The general merriment and banqueting that characterize the beginning of the story turn into a Jewish fast and mourning. Esther prepares a banquet in the midst of her own fast. Jewish salvation is celebrated through large quantities of food and drink. What do the protagonists aim to achieve through self-imposed fasting or through feasting? Ahab's initial fast prompts the ('criminal') action of his wife; his second fast rekindles God's mercy. For all intents and purposes, then, fasting is a powerful weapon of achieving personal purposes. Mordechai's fast at the gate of the palace

⁽²⁶⁾ WALSH, "Methods", 204, on fasting as a component of penitential practices and religious observances that furnishes a bond between the two parts of 1 Kgs 21 and as a clue to deciphering the tale as an attack on the stability of society that laws and religious practices guarantee. On eating and drinking as paralleling the motifs of life and death, *ibid.*, 205, 207-208.

upon learning of Haman's decree constitutes a transgression of the law of the land and reinforces the image of Jewish recalcitrance that Haman had portrayed. The general Jewish fast following the Ahasuerus-Haman decree seems equally incapable of averting doom. Only Esther appears to use the period of fasting as a preparation for a difficult task ahead. The irony is palpable. To approach a monarch whose main claim to fame is the celebration of lavish banquets Esther and her people have to experience the opposite of a royal lifestyle.

In a series of intriguing and intricate inversions the Esther scroll adopts and adapts actions and protagonists of the Jezebel story to convey, ultimately, a similar message. Just as Naboth's real murderers are doomed to perdition Haman's plans are destined to lead to his own undoing. Beyond such simplistic similarities lies, however, a complex ideology. Because of the origins of the Israelite monarchy the power of kings must remain limited. In a post-exilic existence, such as the scroll of Esther depicts, there is in fact no room at all for a Jewish king. The only viable royalty is that of a gentile monarch. In this context a Jewish queen is born, or rather created, not as a consort of a Jewish king but as an instrument to save her people in a moment of exigency.

IV. Conclusion: Jezebel the 'sorceress' and Elijah the 'magician'

In the encounter between Elijah and Ahab over the royal appropriation of private property, Naboth's death is described as a 'murder' (1 Kgs 21,19)⁽²⁷⁾. There is, however, no murderer in the plain and direct sense of the word. Kings or queens need not resort to bloodying their hands. The punishment to which Ahab and Jezebel are subjected as a result of Naboth's death makes, therefore, little sense. In the annals of the Israelite monarchy a similarly motivated murder, notably that of Uriah by David (2 Sam 11), is cast as an act of impiety against God⁽²⁸⁾. And although the prophet Nathan pronounces a twofold punishment, neither David himself nor his dynasty are destined to immediate extinction as Ahab's is. Furthermore, Ahab

⁽²⁷⁾ A rare word, used mostly in prescriptions regarding cities of refuge and, of course, in the Decalogue. See H. ZLOTNICK, *Covenant of Words. A Feminist Reading of the Ten Commandments* (forthcoming).

⁽²⁸⁾ M. WHITE, "Naboth's Vineyard and Jehu's Coup: The Legitimation of a Dynastic Extermination", *VT* 44 (1994) 68-69, on parallels between the two tales and the casting of 1 Kgs in the mold of the David-Bathsheba-Uriah tale.

meets his death through a ruse, precisely the same type of stratagem that his wife had employed to secure his happiness.

In Deuteronomistic narratives when kings commit crimes they are reprimanded by prophets, retract, and are duly punished by YHWH. But when the agent of the 'crime' is a woman, a foreigner, and a queen the story gains a twist. The king appears to lose his will and to recede into inactivity. The queen adopts royal tactics and commands the scene. Like David, Jezebel entrusts visibility to trusted brokers. Unlike David, she is never confronted directly either by YHWH or by a prophet. Such privileged mode of communication is solely the right of impious kings.

To justify in full the elimination of a legitimate monarch (Ahab) and of his legitimate queen the Dtr narrative(s) compound(s) Jezebel's guilt in the Naboth case with other charges. In a deadly encounter between Jehoram of Israel, Ahazia of Judaea and Jehu, the latter newly anointed by Elisha, Jezebel is accused of sorcery and prostitution (2 Kgs 9,22b). The allegation is puzzling. At redactional level it denotes the full enormity of her impiety. A comparison with Tanaquil, however, hints at a different possibility.

'Expert in the interpretation of celestial signs like most Etruscans' Tanaquil reinforces her husband's ambitions and plans by relating tidings from the gods⁽²⁹⁾. Tanaquil's supernatural gifts, the result of her particular brand of Etruscan religiosity, contribute to her exceptional standing in the palace. The gods communicate their wishes through her interpretative skills, enabling her to serve both the family and the state. Conversely, Jezebel's 'magical' powers emphasize the queen's blatant violation of Yahwist piety and royal (Dtr) ideology. What Livy construed in Tanaquil's case as an inordinate and positive brand of religiosity is condemned in the biblical narrative as female 'sorcery' and 'prostitution'⁽³⁰⁾.

The negative hue firmly attached to Jezebel's 'sorcery', in itself a trait that is never quite demonstrated in the narrative, is best explained within the context of her rivalry with Elijah⁽³¹⁾. In the Elijah saga the prophet constantly engages in 'sorcery' or in miraculous demon-

⁽²⁹⁾ Titus Livius, *Ab urbe* 1.34.9 (Foster's translation).

⁽³⁰⁾ SCHULTE, "The End", 142, interprets the phrase as a reflection on Jezebel's role as a priestess of fertility cults.

⁽³¹⁾ N. NA'AMAN, "Prophetic Stories as Sources for the Histories of Jehoshaphat and the Omrides", *Bib* 78 (1997) 160, on the shaping of the negative evaluation of Ahab's reign through their embedding in the Elijah cycle.

stration of his Yahwist attachment. His brand of magic is a sure sign of his being 'a man of God(s)' (1 Kgs 17,24) and of YHWH being the only one and true God (1 Kgs 18,39). While Jezebel's 'magic' secures the succession of her son in spite of prophetic doom, Elijah's parallel powers require constant attestation⁽³²⁾. In the greatest magic show Elijah disappears out of human purview. Jezebel, unaided by the Baal or by witchcraft, is torn asunder and her blood drenches the earth. Yet, it is precisely Elijah's heroic proportion that serves to magnify Jezebel's sorcery.

The charge of prostitution, as has been often remarked, appears calculated to invoke Jezebel's apostasy and her commitment to the Baal⁽³³⁾. In the mouth of Jehu and in the ears of Jezebel's son the word echoes with further irony. It reminds the audience that her betrayal of YHWH and of his prophets (= prostitution) had been as vigorous and disastrous as her loyalty to her husband and to her god. Such an interpretation receives support from the fact that the scene between Jezebel's son and her destined murderer (Jehu) is carefully placed in Jezreel, on Naboth's former plot (2 Kgs 9,21).

Jezebel, the 'prostitute' and the 'witch', violates norms of kingly behavior and weakens the precarious balance of power between kings and YHWH's prophets⁽³⁴⁾. Her promotion of the Baal undermines YHWH's sphere of influence. Impious, sacrilegious, and a transgressor of the boundaries of women and of queens, Jezebel is cast as the antithesis of what a Jewish queen ought to be. To remedy the damage that she had inflicted on the delicate balance between YHWH and Israel Esther is created in her reversed image.

By shadowing Jezebel through Esther the scroll also provides a

⁽³²⁾ The notice in 1 Kgs 22,53, in itself an exception to the rule of recording exclusive male succession, seems to support the assumption of Jezebel's success and status.

⁽³³⁾ Blood and prostitution/prostitutes constitute another underlying redactional theme, beginning with 1 Kgs 22,38 where the blood washed off Ahab's chariot washed prostitutes in Samaria and ending with 2 Kgs 9,22b. On the former as a late insertion, I. BENZINGER, *Die Bücher der Könige erklärt* (KHC 9; Leipzig 1899).

⁽³⁴⁾ Jezebel's sorcery or witchcraft, in other words the attribution of supernatural powers through her links with the Baal, must be contrasted with the functions of YHWH's prophets, above all with the supernatural qualities that they possess through their faith in YHWH. On the latter see the remarks of C. GROTTANELLI, *Kings and Prophets. Monarchic Power, Inspired Leadership, and Sacred Text in Biblical Narrative* (New York 1998) 134-135.

commentary on the desirability of a kingship in general and on the character and activities of queens in particular. Clothing the tale of Jezebel and Ahab in an exilic garb further served to remind the audience of the perils inherent in intermarriage⁽³⁵⁾. The absence of the habitual condemnation of intermarriage in the scroll of Esther is as striking as is the absence of YHWH. In the exilic existence that the Esther tale aspires to delineate the only acceptable Jewish queen is, strangely, one who is matched not with a Jewish king but with a gentile one. Nor are her royal functions of relevance. Esther does not bear children to the king, nor does she secure the dynasty. The absence of these critical components of all royal marriages is important. She is brought into the harem to serve a single purpose that, strictly speaking, has nothing whatsoever to do with her.

With superb irony the narrator of Esther's and Mordechai's vicissitudes at the court leaves both YHWH and prophets out of the story. Their absence raises the larger question of the place of YHWH in exile and outside the promised land of Israel. Although the issue of idolatry and apostasy is never raised, Haman's words to Ahasuerus vividly illustrate the problems of the preservation of the Torah in a non-Jewish territory. Even God cannot appear in this context. At the heart of the rehabilitative narrative of the scroll lies, therefore, an unsolved problem, an end without an end. As Esther fulfils the purpose that Mordechai assigns her readers are left in the dark regarding the 'happily ever after'. How long did the king's affection last? If cyclical, as the beginning of the story strongly suggests, Esther's end could have resembled Vashti's.

Ultimately the biblical narrative excised queens altogether. In exilic redactional perspectives figures such as Jezebel remained a threat even in remote hindsight. The only viable royal woman was one whose movements were controlled by men. If the prospect of reviving the monarchy occasionally crossed the exilic horizons, the possibility of another Jezebel could never be entertained. From the very beginning kingship had been unpalatable to YHWH and to His prophets. Their aversion had been, seemingly, fully justified. Anyone who contemplates the redacted annals of the impieties of the Israelite and the Judaeans kings, and the activities of their queens, must share the Deuteronomistic conviction of the futility of Jewish kingship.

⁽³⁵⁾ ROFÉ, "Vineyard", 102, briefly noted the text's 'protest against intermarriage' that texts of the period voice. On Ezra-Nehemiah's attitude to intermarriage see H. ZLOTNICK "The Silent Women of Yehud", *JJS* 51 (2000) 3-18.

In Jewish history the monarchy began with Saul son of Kish, a Benjaminite. The last royal member of the house, Esther, likewise a Benjaminite and a scion of Saul, becomes a queen in a gentile court, thus concluding a period that had started with prophetic indignation against the appointment of kings (1 Sam 8) and ended with the abandonment of the Jewish people to their fate in a gentile-dominated diaspora. In a summary of the monarchical era the exilic Dtr historian accuses the Israelites of deliberately provoking the wrath of YHWH through their devotion to evil (2 Kgs 17,17). The words provide an uncanny echo of the aberration that Ahab had practiced under the influence of Jezebel⁽³⁶⁾. Between Saul and Esther, then, tower the figures of Jezebel and Ahab as symbols of all the evil inherent in the ideology and the very existence of an Israelite/Jewish monarchy.

Department of History
The University of Kansas
3001 Wescoe Hall
Lawrence, KA 66045-2130 (USA)

Helena ZLOTNICK

SUMMARY

Only three royal couples in the HB are seen in direct communication. Of these, two, namely Ahab and Jezebel, Ahasuerus and Esther, contribute unique insights into the interpretative and redactional processes that cast later narratives around themes of earlier stories, and both around the figure of a queen. In this article I explore the hypothesis that the scroll of Esther was shaped as a reversible version of the Jezebel cycle. With the aid of narratives of the early Roman monarchy, a sensitive and sensible reading of the biblical texts relating to Jezebel and Esther demonstrates the constructive process of an ideology of queenship. Underlying both constructs is a condemnation of monarchy in general.

⁽³⁶⁾ M.Z. BRETTLER, *The Creation of History in Ancient Israel* (London 1995) 122.

Formkritik und Leserrezeption.

Ein Beitrag zur Methodendiskussion am Beispiel Mk 9,14-29

Wenn im deutschsprachigen Raum von der *Formkritik* neu-testamentlicher Texte die Rede ist, so verbindet sich dieser Begriff in vielen Fällen mit den Gedanken von Martin Dibelius und Rudolf Bultmann, den "Vätern" der sog. "formgeschichtlichen Schule"⁽¹⁾: Um den zeitlichen Graben zwischen der schriftlichen Niederlegung der Evangelien und dem historischen Jesus zu überbrücken, versuchten diese Autoren aus der konkreten Form von Texten vor allem der synoptischen Evangelien Schlüsse auf deren "Überlieferungsgeschichte"⁽²⁾ zu ziehen⁽³⁾. Diese Brücke zwischen synchron orientierter Analyse der formalen Struktur von Einzeltexten sowie ihrer Einordnung in die zugehörige "Gattung", also der "Formkritik" im engeren Sinne⁽⁴⁾, und dem diachronen Interesse der "Formgeschichte" wurde über einige methodische Grundaxiome hergestellt, die heute mehr und mehr der Kritik ausgesetzt sind:

(1) Erinnert sei vor allem an folgende Werke: M. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (BEvTh 54; Tübingen ¹1930), das erstmals 1919 erschien, und R. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (FRLANT 29; Göttingen ¹⁰1995) aus dem Jahre 1921. Daneben seien aber weitere wichtige Schrittmacher wie K.L. SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (Berlin 1919); M. ALBERTZ, *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche* (Berlin 1921); G. BERTRAM, *Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult. Eine formgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (FRLANT 32; Göttingen 1922), oder im englischen Raum V. TAYLOR, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (London ²1935) nicht vergessen.

(2) Unter "Überlieferungsgeschichte" sei hier mit J. ROLOFF, *Neues Testament* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1977) 15, die "Entwicklung des abgeschlossenen Einzelstücks einer Gattung im Fortgang des Überlieferungsprozesses von seiner ersten Entstehung hin bis zu seiner vorliegenden Endgestalt" verstanden.

(3) Zum historischen Anliegen der "formgeschichtlichen Schule", vgl. z. B. die ausführliche Darstellung bei M.J. BUSS, *Biblical Form Criticism in its Context* (JSOTSS 274; Sheffield 1999) 286-308.

(4) Die Begrifflichkeiten werden in der Literatur nicht ganz einheitlich verwendet. Im Folgenden soll unter "Form" die strukturelle Gestalt des jeweiligen Einzeltextes, unter "Gattung" das "überindividuelle (typische) Gepräge selbständiger sprachlicher Einheiten" (K. KOCH, *Was ist Formgeschichte?* Methoden der Biblexegese [Neukirchen-Vluyn 1967] 6) verstanden werden.

1. Der ästhetisch begründete Gedanke von der "Ursprünglichkeit der reinen Form" lässt sich wohl nicht halten. Weder eine Entwicklung von der "reinen" zur "unreinen" Form, noch der umgekehrte Prozess lässt sich als Regel sicherstellen⁽⁵⁾.

2. Auch die Vorstellung eines direkten, einlinig-funktionalen Bezuges zwischen der "Gattung" und ihrem "Sitz im Leben" gerät mehr und mehr ins Wanken⁽⁶⁾.

Mit dem steigenden Bewusstsein für die Brüchigkeit der traditionellen Verbindung zwischen synchron verstandener Formkritik und diachron interessierter Form- bzw. Überlieferungsgeschichte ist jedoch keine der beiden Fragestellungen in ihrer Bedeutung bereits erledigt oder gar ausgeschöpft. Die Krise klassischer methodischer Ansätze mag vielmehr auch den Blick auf neue Möglichkeiten und Verbindungen freigeben⁽⁷⁾: In diesem Kontext versteht sich das Anliegen der folgenden Untersuchung, die auf eine weniger beachtete — aber eigentlich naheliegende — methodische Verbindungslinie hinweisen möchte: Es geht um den Bezug zwischen synchron

⁽⁵⁾ Vgl. hierzu z. B. die Ergebnisse von E.P. SANDERS, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (SNTSMS 9; Cambridge 1969) 272-276. Die These, die Tendenz der Entwicklung ginge von der "unreinen" zur "reinen" Form hat K. HAACKER, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*. Eine Einführung in Fragestellungen und Methoden (Wuppertal 1981) 57-61, vertreten, wurde dafür aber u. a. von G. SELLIN, "'Gattung' und 'Sitz im Leben' auf dem Hintergrund der Problematik von Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit synoptischer Erzählungen", *EvTh* 50 (1990) 311-331, esp. 317, kritisiert: "Transformationen einer Erzählung im Überlieferungsprozeß sind grundsätzlich nicht zu berechnen".

⁽⁶⁾ Vgl. z. B. SELLIN, *Gattung*, 325: "Aus der gattungsspezifischen *Form* der Texte allein ist der 'Sitz im Leben' in der Regel nicht zu erschließen. Einer der Hauptmängel der klassischen Formgeschichte ist aber wohl gerade die einlinig-funktionale Zuordnung von Gattung und 'ihrem' 'Sitz im Leben'".

⁽⁷⁾ Eine Reihe von Neuansätzen ist bereits erfolgt und wird diskutiert. Vgl. z. B. die Neubestimmung formgeschichtlichen Arbeitens bei K. BERGER, *Einführung in die Formgeschichte* (Tübingen 1987); DERS., *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments* (Heidelberg 1984); DERS., "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament", *ANRW* II.25.2 (Berlin 1984) 1031-1432, 1831-1885. Dagegen hat W. SCHMITHALS, "Kritik der Formkritik", *ZThK* 77 (1980) 149-185; DERS., "Die Heilung des Epileptischen (Mk. 9,14-29). Ein Beitrag zur notwendigen Revision der Formgeschichte", *ThViat* 13 (1975/76) 211-233, u. a. die Annahme kritisiert, die markinischen Erzählstoffe seien jemals in mündlicher Tradition überliefert worden, und deshalb auf die literarkritische Methodik zurückverwiesen. Eine forschungsgeschichtliche Übersicht bietet daneben G. SCHELBERT, "Wo steht die Formgeschichte?", *Theologische Berichte* 13 (1985) 11-37.

orientierter Formkritik und der Frage der Leserrezeption eines konkreten Textes⁽⁸⁾.

I. Formkritik und Leserrezeption. Methodische Verbindungslinien

Versteht man unter "Gattungen" "conventional and repeatable patterns of oral and written speech, which facilitate interaction among people in specific social situations"⁽⁹⁾ und bedenkt gleichzeitig, dass die gemeinten immer wiederkehrenden "Sitze im Leben" im Grunde nur Abstraktionen tatsächlicher, in Wirklichkeit niemals wiederholbarer einmaliger Situationen darstellen, so ergibt sich damit nicht nur ein Bezug zwischen dem "abstrakten", im konkreten Fall nie vollkommen repräsentierten "Gattungsmuster" und dem zugehörigen "Sitz im Leben" — verstanden als "Situationsmuster"⁽¹⁰⁾, sondern auch zwischen der Form eines Einzeltextes — mit allen Abweichungen und Übereinstimmungen zum "Gattungsmuster" — und seiner tatsächlichen Funktion in einer einmaligen Situation *in der Geschichte*, die nur bedingt mit dem Abstraktum "Sitz im Leben" übereinstimmen kann. Auch wenn sich die geschichtliche Kommunikationssituation, in die hinein ein Text gesprochen oder geschrieben ist, fast nie mit Sicherheit bestimmen lässt⁽¹¹⁾, so dürfte dennoch ein Bezug zwischen der konkreten "Form" des Textes und seinen Wirkabsichten im Hinblick auf den "Leser" bzw. "Hörer" nicht abzustreiten sein. Da die "empirischen Erstleser/hörer" eines Textes mit ihren konkreten Reaktionen aber im Normalfall nicht oder nur äußerst hypothetisch greifbar sind, muss die literaturwissenschaftliche Kategorie des

(8) Dass der im Folgenden dargestellte Ansatz sich der synchronen Fragerichtung biblischer Exegese verpflichtet fühlt, darf nicht in dem Sinne missverstanden werden, dass damit diachrone Ansätze an sich abgelehnt würden. Diese sind vielmehr nicht nur als berechtigt, sondern im Bezug auf manche, u. a. historische Fragestellungen als unabdingbar anzusehen.

(9) J.L. BAILEY, "Genre Analysis", *Hearing the New Testament. Strategies for Interpretation* (Hrsg. J.B. GREEN) (Grand Rapids – Carlisle 1995) 197-221, esp. 200. Zwar gebraucht Bailey hier die Bezeichnung "Genre", er verwendet diesen Begriff aber in dem Sinne des deutschen "Gattung".

(10) Dieser von Hermann Gunkel geprägte Begriff wird manchmal im Sinne konkreter geschichtlicher Situationen missverstanden. Gemeint sind aber "immer wiederkehrende, *typische Situationen*", wie z. B. auch HAACKER, *Wissenschaft*, 49, betont.

(11) Dies gilt natürlich für narrative Texte noch mehr als z. B. im Falle von Briefliteratur.

“impliziten Lesers” aus dem Dilemma helfen. Aufschlussreich ist hierfür besonders die Definition, welche W. Iser gibt⁽¹²⁾:

... er verkörpert die Gesamtheit der Vorstellungen, die ein fiktionaler Text seinen möglichen Lesern als Rezeptionsbedingungen anbietet. Folglich ist der implizite Leser nicht in einem empirischen Substrat verankert, sondern in der Struktur des Textes selbst fundiert. Wenn wir davon ausgehen, daß Texte erst in ihrem Gelesenwerden ihre Realität gewinnen, so heißt dies, daß in dem Verfaßtsein der Texte Aktualisierungsbedingungen eingezeichnet sein müssen, die es erlauben, den Sinn des Textes im Rezeptionsbewußtsein des Empfängers zu konstruieren. Daher bezeichnet das Konzept des impliziten Lesers eine Textstruktur, durch die der Empfänger immer schon vorgedacht ist ...

Wenn nun aber der “implizite Leser” laut Definition gerade in der Struktur, m.a.W. also der konkreten “Form” des Textes verankert ist, so kann die “Formkritik” in einen methodischen Bezug zur Rezeption eines Textes durch den “impliziten Leser” gesetzt werden. Die konkrete “Form” eines Textes steht aber immer auch in einem Verhältnis zum “Muster” der Gattung, der der konkrete Text angehört, besitzt also für die Gattung “typische”, aber auch “untypische” Elemente⁽¹³⁾. Wo die ersteren besonders stark ausgeprägt sind, ist auch die Funktion — und damit verbunden die Wirkabsicht — in weitgehender Analogie zu der für die allgemeine Gattung des Textes zu bestimmen. “Untypische” Elemente dagegen signalisieren zwangsläufig Abweichungen. Damit aber ergibt sich eine Reihe methodischer Einsichten, die m.E. durchaus geeignet sind das übliche Methodeninstrumentarium zur Bestimmung der Wirkung eines Textes auf den “impliziten Leser” zu bereichern⁽¹⁴⁾:

1. Für die Gattung typische einleitende “Motive”⁽¹⁵⁾ wecken

⁽¹²⁾ W. ISER, *Der Akt des Lesens. Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung* (München 1984) 60-61. Zur Problematik der “Fiktionalität” biblischer Texte, vgl. T. NICKLAS, *Ablösung und Verstrickung. Eine Analyse von “Juden” und Jüngergestalten als Charakteren der erzählten Welt des Johannesevangeliums und ihrer Wirkung auf den impliziten Leser* (RStTh; Frankfurt u.a. 2001) [im Druck].

⁽¹³⁾ Diese Begrifflichkeit verwendet auch HAACKER, *Wissenschaft*, 51-52.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Eine kurze, aber durchaus gut brauchbare Einführung in die angesprochenen Methoden bietet z. B. M.A. POWELL, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis 1990). Powell überträgt nicht nur die Ergebnisse allgemeiner Literaturwissenschaften auf die Anforderungen biblischer Exegese, er bietet auch eine Übersicht über die einschlägige Sekundärliteratur.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Vgl. die Definition von G. THEIBEN, *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten. Ein Beitrag zur formgeschichtlichen Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien* (Gütersloh 1974) 16: “Unter Motiven sollen kleinste unselbständige Erzähleinheiten verstanden werden, die oft als einfache Sätze begegnen oder sich

Erwartungen. So wird der Leser⁽¹⁶⁾ z. B. die Einleitung “Es war einmal ...” mit einem “deutschen Märchen” mit all seinen für die Gattung typischen Elementen verbinden.

2. Im einzelnen “Gattungsexemplar”, also dem konkreten Text, können für die Gattung konstitutive oder mögliche Motive breit oder weniger breit ausgeführt sein. Je mehr Raum der “Erzähler”⁽¹⁷⁾ aber einem Motiv einräumt, desto mehr Gewicht legt er auf es. Gleichzeitig lenkt er damit auch die Aufmerksamkeit des Lesers.

3. Diese Beobachtung lässt sich aber nicht einfach umkehren. Ein nur schmal ausgeführtes Motiv muss nicht unbedingt bedeuten, dass damit die Aufmerksamkeit des Lesers nur gering in Anspruch genommen wird: Entfällt z. B. ein für die Gattung wichtiges Element, so *kann* damit eine “Leerstelle” entstehen. Gerade Leerstellen aber zwingen den Leser zur Ergänzung, zum Ausfüllen des “Nicht-Gesagten” und involvieren ihn damit mehr und mehr in das Erzählte⁽¹⁸⁾.

4. Von besonderer Bedeutung aber sind auch für die Gattung “untypische” Elemente. Diese können einerseits darin bestehen, dass gattungstypische Motive an einem für sie untypischen Ort begegnen. Andererseits aber können auch Motive fremder Gattungen auftauchen. In beiden Fällen ist dann davon auszugehen, dass Lesererwartungen enttäuscht und umgelenkt werden.

II. Das Beispiel: Mk 9,14-29

Um diese theoretischen Überlegungen mit exegetischem Leben zu erfüllen, sei das Gemeinte an einem übersichtlichen Beispiel dargestellt. Die Perikope Mk 9,14-29 empfiehlt sich dabei wegen ihrer gleichzeitigen Komplexität wie Einfachheit. So spielte sie aufgrund ihrer formalen Besonderheiten bereits in der *formgeschichtlichen*

als solche wiedergeben lassen, auch wenn sie an anderer Stelle mehrere Sätze oder nur ein Satzglied umfassen”.

(16) Gemeint sei im Folgenden der “implizite Leser”. Dass dies auch für manche *reale* Leser bzw. Hörer zutrifft, ist klar. Es sei aber auch daran erinnert, dass eventuell ein Leser aus einem fremden Kulturkreis mit der ihm eventuell unbekannten Gattung eines “deutschen Märchens” nichts anzufangen weiß.

(17) Zur literaturwissenschaftlichen Kategorie des “Erzählers”, vgl. die kurze Zusammenfassung bei POWELL, *Narrative Criticism*, 25-27.

(18) Zu “Leerstellen”, vgl. z. B. U. ECO, *Lector in fabula*. Die Mitarbeit der Interpretation in erzählenden Texten (München 1990) 62-64.

Diskussion eine große Rolle⁽¹⁹⁾. Da sie sich in die Gattung "neutestamentlicher Wundergeschichten" einordnen lässt, für die G. Theißen eine Übersicht möglicher Motive erstellt hat⁽²⁰⁾, lässt sich hier gleichzeitig aber auch besonders leicht "Typisches" von "Untypischem" scheiden⁽²¹⁾.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Auf BULTMANN, *Geschichte*, 225-226, geht die Vorstellung zurück, in Mk 9,14-29 seien zwei ursprünglich gesonderte Wundergeschichten verbunden. Vgl. z. B. auch P.J. ACHTEMEIER, "Miracles and the Historical Jesus. A Study of Mark 9:14-29", *CBQ* 37 (1975) 471-491, esp. 477-482; R.H. FULLER, *Die Wunder Jesu in Exegese und Verkündigung* (Düsseldorf 1967) 41, 69; D.A. KOCH, *Die Bedeutung der Wundererzählungen für die Christologie des Markusevangeliums* (BZNW 42; Berlin – New York 1975) 115-116; R. LATOURELLE, *Miracles de Jésus et Théologie du Miracle* (Recherches 8; Montréal – Paris 1986) 175. Diese These begegnet auch in der Modifikation, dass der Evangelist Mk zwei Versionen derselben Wundergeschichte verbunden habe. Vgl. z. B. G. BORNKAMM, "Τινεῖμα ἄλλαν. Eine Studie zum Markusevangelium", *Das Altertum und jedes neue Gute* (Hrsg. K. GAISER) (Stuttgart u.a. 1970) 369-385, esp. 371. Die Tendenz geht aber mehr und mehr in die Richtung, dass Mk 9,14-29 aus ursprünglich einer Wundererzählung aufgrund komplex zu bestimmender Wachstumsprozesse entstanden sei. Vgl. z. B. K. KERTELGE, *Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (StANT 23; München 1970) 174-177; B. KOLLMANN, *Jesus und die Christen als Wundertäter. Studien zu Magie, Medizin und Schamanismus in Antike und Christentum* (FRLANT 170; Göttingen 1996) 210-211; G. PETZKE, "Die historische Frage nach den Wundertaten Jesu. Dargestellt am Beispiel des Exorzismus Mark IX.14-29 par.", *NTS* 22 (1976) 180-204, esp. 188-191; J. ROLOFF, *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus. Historische Motive in den Jesus-Erzählungen der Evangelien* (Göttingen 1973) 146-151; W. SCHENK, "Tradition und Redaktion in der Epileptiker-Perikope Mk 9¹⁴⁻²⁹", *ZNW* 63 (1972) 76-94, esp. 93-94; L. SCHENKE, *Die Wundererzählungen des Markusevangeliums* (SBB 5; Stuttgart 1974) 314-334, und T. SÖDING, *Glaube bei Markus. Glaube an das Evangelium, Gebetsglaube und Wunderglaube im Kontext der markinischen Basileiatheorie und Christologie* (SBB 12; Stuttgart 1985) 461-463.

SCHMITHALS, "Heilung", schließlich hat gerade Mk 9,14-29 als Paradigma seiner Kritik der "formgeschichtlichen" Methode ausgewählt.

⁽²⁰⁾ Vgl. THEIßEN, *Wundergeschichten*, 82-83.

⁽²¹⁾ Zusätzlich sei der Aspekt erwähnt, dass sich m.W. in der Literatur kaum eine Arbeit findet, die Mk 9,14-29 unter rezeptionsästhetischer Fragestellung untersucht. Hingewiesen sei allerdings auf die für die narrative Untersuchung des Markusevangeliums grundlegende Monographie von D. RHOADS – D. MICHIE, *Mark as Story. An Introduction to the Narrative of the Gospel* (Philadelphia 1984) und den Kommentar von B. VAN IERSEL, *Markus. Kommentar* (Düsseldorf 1993). Weniger brauchbar ist dagegen J.P. HEIL, *The Gospel of Mark as a Model for Action. A Reader-Response Commentary* (New York – Mahwah 1992) 1-4, 191-196, der zwar vom "impliziten Leser" des Textes spricht, diesen aber, wie seine Einleitung beweist, immer wieder mit vom realen Autor angezielten "historischen Erstleser" vermengt.

In der folgenden Analyse seien nun die vorgeschlagenen, aus der Formkritik abgeleiteten methodischen Schritte eingebettet in die zur Ermittlung der Lenkung des "impliziten Lesers" durch den Autor notwendigen Methoden.

1. Strukturanalyse

Der Text lässt sich vielleicht am besten grob in drei große Einheiten einteilen⁽²²⁾: (1) Einleitung/Exposition (9,14-19b); (2) Heilung (9,19c-27); (3) Jüngergespräch (9,28-29).

Damit ist aber die Struktur des Textes noch keineswegs adäquat beschrieben. So besteht die "Einleitung/Exposition" aus mehreren Teilen:

- a) Szene (9,14-15):
 - Rückkehr 9,14
 - Reaktion der Menge 9,15
- b) Dialog (9,16-19):
 - Frage Jesu 9,16
 - Antwort des Vaters 9,17-18
 - Antwort Jesu 9,19ab

Teil 2, die Heilung, lässt sich folgendermaßen feingliedern:

- a) Szene (9,19c-20c):
 - Befehl Jesu 9,19c
 - Bringen des Leidenden 9,20a
 - Reaktion des Geistes 9,20bc
- b) Dialog (9,21-24):
 - Frage Jesu 9,21ab
 - Antwort des Vaters 9,21c-22
 - Antwort Jesu 9,23
 - Antwort des Vaters 9,24
- c) Eigentliche Heilung (9,25-27):
 - Ausfahrbefehl 9,25
 - Reaktion des Geistes 9,26a
 - Beschreibung des Geheilten 9,26b
 - Reaktion der Menge 9,26c
 - Bestätigung der Heilung 9,27

⁽²²⁾ Die Gliederung ist nicht ganz einfach, wie auch die unterschiedlichen Gliederungsvorschläge bei R.H. GUNDRY, *Mark. A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids 1993) 487; K. KERTELGE, *Markusevangelium* (NEB.NT 2; Würzburg 1994) 90-91; O. KNOCH, *Dem, der glaubt, ist alles möglich. Die Botschaft der Wundererzählungen der Evangelisten. Ein Werkbuch zur Bibel* (Stuttgart 1986) 295; E. LOHMEYER, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (KEK 2; Göttingen 1967) 184; C.D. MARSHALL, *Faith as a Theme in Mark's Narrative* (SNTSMS 64; Cambridge u.a. 1989) 114; R. PESCH, *Das Markusevangelium* (HThK II/2; Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1984) II, 86, und vielen anderen beweisen.

Naheliegend ist schließlich auch eine Einteilung von Teil 3 in folgende Abschnitte:

- a) Frage der Jünger (9,28)
- b) Antwort Jesu (9,29)

2. Formkritische Fragestellungen

Legt man das von G. Theißen erarbeitete "Inventar der Motive"⁽²³⁾ neutestamentlicher Wundergeschichten an den in Mk 9,14-29 erzählten Exorzismus an, so ergibt sich folgende Übersicht⁽²⁴⁾:

(1) Mk 9,14-19b:

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| a) 9,14-15 | Kommen des Wundertäters
Auftreten der Menge
Auftreten von Gegnern
Admiration |
| b) 9,16-19b | Auftreten eines Stellvertreters
Charakterisierung der Not
Hinweis auf Bitte an die Jünger
fehlende Konstatierung des Wunders
Pneumatische Erregung |

(2) Mk 9,19c-27:

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| a) 9,19c-20c | Szenische Vorbereitung
Gegenwehr des Dämon |
| b) 9,21-24 | Erneutes Auftreten des Stellvertreters
Erneute Charakterisierung der Not
Hilferuf
Bitten und Vertrauensäußerung
Erneuter Hilferuf |
| c) 9,25-27 | Erneutes Auftreten der Menge
Wunderwirkendes Wort
Erste Konstatierung des Wunders
(Schilderung einer erneuten Notlage)
Ablehnende Reaktion
Berührung
Zweite Konstatierung des Wunders |

Die Jüngerbelehrung der VV. 28-29 ist dagegen für eine neutestamentliche Wundergeschichte singulär, lässt sich damit nicht einordnen.

⁽²³⁾ Vgl. THEIßEN, *Wundergeschichten*, 82-83.

⁽²⁴⁾ Vergleichbare Übersichten bieten auch H.D. BETZ, "The Early Christian Miracle Story: Some Observations on the Form Critical Problem", *Semeia* 11 (1978) 69-81, esp. 75-79; W. BROADHEAD, *Teaching with Authority. Miracles and the Christology of the Gospel of Mark* (JSNTSS 74; Sheffield 1992) 154, die beide allerdings nicht Theißens Modell voraussetzen, sowie PESCH, *Markusevangelium*, II, 86-94, allerdings in Bezug auf die von ihm rekonstruierte vormarkinische Erzählung.

Für die vorliegende Fragestellung ist aber nicht in erster Linie das Motivraaster als solches interessant, sondern vielmehr die Besonderheiten der hier vorliegenden Erzählung:

1. Im ersten Teil fällt besonders die Verbindung zwischen dem “Kommen des Wundertäters” — direkt angeschlossen an die Erzählung von der Verklärung — mit dem eigentlich finalen Motiv der “Admiration” auf. Gerade die Tatsache, dass letzteres an einem “untypischen Ort” begegnet, dürfte für die Leserrezeption besonders interessant werden⁽²⁵⁾.

Bereits im ersten Teil wird die Notlage breit geschildert. Sie verbindet sich hier mit einem Hinweis auf eine bereits erfolgte Bitte an die Jünger und einer Konstatierung, dass das von dieser Seite her erhoffte Wunder nicht geglückt sei. Damit kann V. 18 aber formkritisch als eine Art “Wundererzählung” in der Wundererzählung aufgefasst werden, allerdings eine “untypische”, nämlich mit negativem Ausgang.

V. 19a-b schließlich lässt sich wohl als “pneumatische Erregung” in das Theißen’sche Raster einordnen⁽²⁶⁾, gleichzeitig muss er aber als “Scheltwort” in Form zweier paralleler rhetorischer Fragen aufgefasst werden⁽²⁷⁾.

2. Beim Motiv der “Gegenwehr des Dämons” fällt natürlich auf, dass dieser nicht spricht, was natürlich mit seiner Bezeichnung als πνεῦμα ἄλλαν in V. 17 zusammenhängt.

Eigenartig ist aber vor allem, dass nun nicht einfach das Wunder geschildert wird, sondern der Stellvertreter erneut — von Jesus angestoßen — aufzutreten hat. Dass nun ein zweites Mal die Not charakterisiert wird, zeigt einerseits einen besonderen Schwerpunkt der Erzählung auf diesem Motiv⁽²⁸⁾. Besonders bedeutsam aber dürfte

⁽²⁵⁾ Hinzu kommt, dass diese “Admiration” mit dem seltenen Verbum ἐκθαμβέομαι beschrieben ist, das neutestamentlich sonst nur in Mk 14,33 sowie 16,5-6 begegnet und geradezu ein “Außer-sich-Geraten” vor Erstaunen bezeichnet. Vgl. hierzu die semantischen Erwägungen bei T. DWYER, *The Motif of Wonder in the Gospel of Mark* (JSNTSS 128; Sheffield 1996) 148, und C. WAGNER, *Die Septuaginta-Hapaxlegomena im Buch Jesus Sirach*. Untersuchungen zu Wortwahl und Wortbildung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des textkritischen und übersetzungstechnischen Aspekts (BZAW 282; Berlin – New York 1999) 184.

⁽²⁶⁾ Vgl. auch PESCH, *Markusevangelium*, II, 90; THEIßEN, *Wundergeschichten*, 67.

⁽²⁷⁾ Vgl. BERGER, *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*, 195, 198, der auch auf die Verwandtschaft zur Klage hinweist.

⁽²⁸⁾ So sieht J.P. MEIER, *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (ABRL; New York u.a. 1994) II, 655, die detaillierte Beschreibung der Krankheit als größte Besonderheit der Erzählung.

besonders eine Verschiebung zu V. 18 sein: Nun ist nicht mehr nur von der Not des Jungen die Rede, vielmehr solidarisiert sich in V. 22 der Vater mit seinem Sohn: Aus dem "Stellvertreter" wird somit selbst ein Notleidender⁽²⁹⁾.

Betrachtet man die Ausformung des Motivs "Bitte und Vertrauensäußerung" genauer, so zeigt sich auch hier "Untypisches", verbindet sich doch die erste Bitte des Vaters mit einer Äußerung nur *eingeschränkten* Vertrauens. Erst das Jesuswort in V. 23 ruft eine unbedingte *Glaubensaussage* hervor, an die sich ein "Hilferuf" anlehnt⁽³⁰⁾: Dieser bezieht sich nun aber nicht mehr wie in V. 22 auf die Heilung des Sohnes, sondern auf den "Unglauben" des Vaters.

Auch die erneute Erwähnung der Menge fällt aus dem Rahmen des Üblichen⁽³¹⁾. Nicht zu vergessen ist u. a. die Tatsache, dass die

Die zweimalige Schilderung der Notlage wurde außerdem häufig literarkritisch als "Doppelung" interpretiert. Dagegen aber haben J. GNILKA, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (EKK II/2; Zürich u.a. 1979) II, 45, und SCHENKE, *Wundererzählungen*, 317, gezeigt, dass die VV. 21-22 durchaus als Fortsetzung von 17-18 zu verstehen sein können. Auch SCHMITHALS, "Heilung", 211, betont m.E. zu Recht, dass die Krankheit nicht in verdoppelnder, sondern "ergänzender Weise" beschrieben werde.

⁽²⁹⁾ Darauf hat u.a. auch J. DELORME, "Signification d'un récit et comparaison synoptique (Marc 9,14-29 et parallèles)", *The Synoptic Gospels. Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (Hrsg. C. FOCANT) (BETHL 110; Löwen 1993) 531-547, esp. 537, hingewiesen.

⁽³⁰⁾ Das in V. 24 entstehende sich scheinbar zu widersprechen scheinende Gegenüber von "Glaube" und "Unglaube" erklärt H. RITT, "Vom Wunderglauben zum Bekenntnisglauben", *Glaubensvermittlung im Umbruch* (FS. M. Müller; [Hrsg. H. PETRI u.a.] Regensburg 1996) 63-82, esp. 76, n. 35, mit der Tatsache, dass das Verbum πιστεύω als Präsens *de conatu* mit "Ich versuche zu glauben" zu übersetzen sei.

⁽³¹⁾ Vorsicht ist allerdings m.E. mit der häufig geäußerten Vermutung geboten, V. 25 stelle eine Doppelung zu V. 14 dar, da ja die Menge, obwohl in V. 14 bereits eingeführt, in V. 25 erst herbeilaufe. Das Problem liegt z.T. in der Übersetzung des Hapaxlegomenons ἐπισυντρέχω. SCHMITHALS, "Heilung", 211, schreibt hierzu: "Das in V. 25 begegnende, sonst unbekannte Wort ἐπισυντρέχω dürfte besagen, daß der Zustrom der Leute sich *verstärkt* bzw. daß die Menge sich in Erwartung der Heilung neugierig bei dem am Boden liegenden Epileptiker zusammendrängt".

Hingewiesen sei daneben auch auf die Argumentation von GUNDRY, *Mark*, 493: "... we noted in the comments that the running in v 25 progresses beyond the running in v 15. Furthermore, running is only a participle in v 15, but it is a main verb in v 25; and the present tense of both forms indicates a continuous running, not two successive runnings. The double mention of it looks like Mark's love of emphatic duality, in this case making a characteristic emphasis on Jesus' magnetism".

eigentliche Wunderhandlung in zwei Etappen erzählt wird: Der erste Schritt findet mit Hilfe eines ausführlich gehaltenen “wunderwirkenden Wortes” statt. Da sich aber die sich daran anschließende “Konstatierung des Wunders” zumindest in ihrem zweiten Teil (9,26b) auch als Schilderung einer erneuten Notlage interpretieren lässt und eine “ablehnende Reaktion” der Menge folgt, ist ein zweiter Schritt notwendig: die “Berührung” des Knaben, die zur endgültigen Konstatierung des Wunders führt. Damit entsteht erneut ein “Wunder im Wunder”, das sich durch die verwendeten Begriffe des “Sterbens und Auf(er)stehens” eindeutig an die Form der “Wiederbelebungs-geschichte” — die Extremform des Heilungswunders — anlehnt⁽³²⁾.

3. Besonders “untypisch” fällt aber der Schluss der untersuchten Erzählung aus: So ist eine sich an ein Wunder anschließende Jüngerbelehrung innerhalb der synoptischen Evangelien ein singulärer Fall. Mindestens genauso bedeutsam aber ist das Fehlen wichtiger *finaler* Motive: So wird keine Reaktion der Menge auf die zweite, endgültige Konstatierung des Wunders erzählt: Weder von einer “Admiration” oder einer “Akklamation” ist die Rede, noch wird die “Ausbreitung des Rufes” oder eine Verschärfung der bereits in V. 26 geschilderten “ablehnenden Reaktion” geschildert.

3. Der Weg des “impliziten Lesers” durch den Text

Verse 9,14-15. V. 14 schließt sich durch einleitendes καί, locker an den Kontext an⁽³³⁾. Gleich im ersten Satz begegnen mehrere Begriffe, die im bisherigen Verlauf des Evangeliums eine wichtige Rolle spielten und so im “impliziten Leser” Assoziationen an bisher Erzähltes hervorrufen. So begegneten die “Jünger” seit ihrer Berufung 1,16-20

⁽³²⁾ Zu dieser Gattung, vgl. S.M. FISCHBACH, *Totenerweckungen*. Zur Geschichte einer Gattung (FzB 69; Würzburg 1992).

⁽³³⁾ Nicht mit letzter Sicherheit kann hier die textkritische Frage entschieden werden. Einiges spricht aber m.E. dafür, dass die singularische Variante ἐλθὼν ... εἶδεν mit ACHEMEIER, “Miracles”, 475, GNILKA, *Markus*, II, 46, als *lectio difficilior* aufzufassen sei. Daneben sprechen sich u.a. auch BULTMANN, *Geschichte*, 225, und E. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium* (HNT 3; Tübingen 1926) 102, für die Ursprünglichkeit dieser Lesart aus. Zwar kann der Singular auch als Angleichung an V. 15 angesehen werden, wie D. LÜHRMANN, *Das Markusevangelium* (HNT 3; Tübingen 1987) 160, und ähnlich PESCH, *Markusevangelium*, II, 84, u. a. betonen, wahrscheinlicher erscheint mir aber eine Angleichung an etwas Vorausgehendes als im Blick auf einen nachfolgenden Text. Nicht ganz nachvollziehbar ist mir die Argumentation bei B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart 1994) 85.

immer wieder als nicht bzw. noch nicht verstehende Begleiter Jesu ⁽³⁴⁾. Mit dem Beginn des Weges nach Jerusalem ab 8,27 hat aber eine neue Phase von Jüngerbelehrungen begonnen: Dabei verbindet sich die Erkenntnis Jesu als des Messias (8,29) mit der, dass dieser Messias seine Sendung in Leid und Tod zu erfüllen habe.

Auch von der Rolle der γραμματεῖς hat der Leser sich schon ein Bild gemacht: So ist seit 1,22 eine Opposition zwischen Jesus und den Schriftgelehrten hergestellt: Im Gegensatz zu diesen lehre Jesus wie einer, der "Vollmacht" habe. Spätestens mit 2,6 schließlich sind sie als Gegner Jesu etabliert. Wenn also in 9,14 Schriftgelehrte begegnen, so kann der Leser erwarten, dass sich mit diesen ein Konflikt verbinden wird. Dies bestätigt sich in der Erwähnung des Begriffes συζητεῖν, der hier einen Disput bzw. eine Auseinandersetzung ausdrücken möchte ⁽³⁵⁾. Auffälligerweise ist kein Grund des Streites genannt ⁽³⁶⁾, der Leser muss also hoffen diese "Leerstelle" im Folgenden durch weitere Informationen des Erzählers füllen zu können. Noch weist außerdem nichts darauf hin, dass die folgende Erzählung von einem Exorzismus handeln wird.

V. 15 nun muss den Leser überraschen: Aus welchem Grunde ist ein derartiges Erstaunen der gesamten Menschenmenge (πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος) — noch dazu "sofort" — denkbar? Der Text verrät es nicht: Damit entsteht wieder eine "Leerstelle", die den Leser zur eigenständigen Aktivität anregt ⁽³⁷⁾. Drückt V. 15 nur die Freude bzw. die große Überraschung des Volkes aus, dass Jesus kommt ⁽³⁸⁾, oder deutet die starke Erregung auf ein "Mehr" hin? So liegt es nahe, dass der Leser eine Verbindung zum Geschehen der Verklärung herstellt ⁽³⁹⁾, auch

⁽³⁴⁾ Zur Rolle der "Jünger" im Markusevangelium, vgl. zuletzt D. DORMEYER, *Das Markusevangelium als Idealbiographie von Jesus Christus, dem Nazarener* (SBB 43; Stuttgart 1999) 185-206.

⁽³⁵⁾ Vgl. die bisherigen Belege des Begriffes Mk 1,27; 8,11 und 9,10.

⁽³⁶⁾ Die präpositionale Wendung πρὸς αὐτούς dürfte sich schon aus kontextuellen Gründen auf die Jünger beziehen.

⁽³⁷⁾ So konvergiert an dieser Stelle ein klassisches Argument der "Rezeptionsästhetik" mit einem der vorgeschlagenen aus der Formkritik erbrachten Argumente.

⁽³⁸⁾ Vgl. hierzu z. B. die Deutungen von E.P. GOULD, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (ICC 2; Edinburgh 1961) 167; C.S. MANN, *Mark* (AB 27; Garden City 1986) 370, und ROLOFF, *Kerygma*, 146.

⁽³⁹⁾ Vgl. z. B. die Vermutungen von GUNDRY, *Mark*, 487-488; M.D. HOOKER, *The Gospel According to St Mark* (BNTC; London 1991) 222; J. PAINTER, *Mark's Gospel. Worlds in Conflict* (New Testament Readings; London – New York 1997)

wenn sich dieser Bezug nicht beweisen lässt. Das formkritisch als „Kommen des Wundertäters“ bezeichnete Motiv (9,14) erhält so durch die Verbindung mit der überraschend platzierten „Admiration“ sowie den vorausgehenden Kontext den Charakter einer „Epiphanie“⁽⁴⁰⁾: V. 15 verleiht dem Folgenden damit eine Aura des Geheimnisvollen und lenkt die Aufmerksamkeit auf die Person Jesu.

Verses 9,16-19b. Jesu Frage aus V. 16 deckt sich im Grunde mit der des Lesers⁽⁴¹⁾: Was hat diese eigenartige Situation zu bedeuten? Worum dreht sich die in V. 14 berichtete Auseinandersetzung und was ist von ihr zu erwarten? Vor diesem Hintergrund wird er die VV. 17-18 als Antwort auffassen, auch wenn sich kein struktureller oder inhaltlicher Bezug zur Frage festmachen lässt⁽⁴²⁾.

Die VV. 17-18 schildern nun in großer Ausführlichkeit eine Notsituation: Für die Leserrezeption ergeben sich gerade aus der Art der Darstellung mehrere Aspekte. Einerseits sind dem Leser bereits seit 1,23-28 Auseinandersetzungen Jesu mit „unreinen Geistern“ bekannt. So kann er eine weitere Erzählung eines erfolgreichen Exorzismus erwarten. Andererseits aber zeigt die Breite der Schilderung des Krankheitsbildes⁽⁴³⁾, dass es sich hier um einen ganz besonderen Fall handeln muss: Einmalig ist z. B. die Bezeichnung des Geistes als „stumm“⁽⁴⁴⁾.

132; P. PERKINS, *The Gospel of Mark* (NIntB 8; Nashville 1995) 633; J. RADERMAKERS, *La bonne nouvelle de Jésus selon Saint Marc* (Brüssel 1974) II, 253, und J. SCHNIEWIND, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (NTD 1; Göttingen 1949) 125.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Darauf haben auch W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (ThHK 2; Berlin 1977) 252; KOCH, *Wundererzählungen*, 124, und SCHMITHALS, „Heilung“, 214, verwiesen.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Der Leser steht hier — bildlich gesprochen — ganz an der Seite Jesu, ist ihm doch das bisherige Geschehen, wie in V. 14 an der Schilderung des „Sehens“ deutlich wird, ganz aus dessen Perspektive geschildert.

⁽⁴²⁾ Diese wird zwar als Antwort eingeführt, es antwortet aber *einer* aus der Menge auf die Frage Jesu, die an eine nicht ganz bestimmbare Mehrzahl von Personen gerichtet ist. In dessen Rede wiederum wird das Motiv der Auseinandersetzung nicht mehr aufgenommen.

⁽⁴³⁾ Es handelt sich natürlich um einen Fall von Epilepsie, der aber hier als Besessenheit interpretiert wird. Zur Epilepsie in der Antike, vgl. z. B. E. LESKY – J.H. WASZINK, „Epilepsie“, *RAC* VI, 819-831.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Vgl. z. B. BORNKAMM, „Πνεῦμα“, 375.

Die Leservermutung über die Besonderheit dieses Falles ergibt sich daneben auch aus der Tatsache, dass ja Jesus bereits schwierigste Exorzismen bewältigt hat: Man denke nur an Mk 5,1-20. Wenn nun ein weiterer berichtet wird, so muss es mit diesem etwas ganz Besonderes auf sich haben.

Der Schluss von V. 18 bildet eine unerwartete Wende: Es folgt nicht die (aus formalen Gründen) erwartete Bitte um Heilung des Sohnes, vielmehr scheint der Bittsteller sich in Abwesenheit Jesu an dessen Jünger gewandt zu haben, diese aber sind gescheitert⁽⁴⁵⁾. So beantwortet sich indirekt die Frage nach dem Inhalt der Auseinandersetzung: Auch wenn dies mit keinem Wort direkt erwähnt ist, kann es sich nur um die Vollmacht der Jünger Jesu — damit aber auch um den Anspruch Jesu — gehandelt haben.

Damit aber ergeben sich neue Probleme: Zwar ist aus dem bisher Erzählten zu erwarten, dass Jesus diesem Anspruch gerecht werden wird, wie dies der Fall sein wird und wo die erwartete Besonderheit dieser Erzählung steckt, ist noch nicht klar⁽⁴⁶⁾. Noch brennender aber ist das ungeklärte Problem, warum die Jünger in diesem Falle versagten: Handelt es sich hier, wie die Breite der Schilderung der Not suggeriert, um einen besonders schwierigen Fall, den nur der "Meister" selbst bewältigen kann⁽⁴⁷⁾?

Auch V. 19 gibt darauf noch keine Antwort: So ist unklar, an wen sich Jesus richtet: Bezieht sich das Personalpronomen αὐτοῖς auf die Menge, die Schriftgelehrten — oder die Jünger⁽⁴⁸⁾? Wieder aber wird

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Einerseits ist das Versagen der Jünger überraschend, war doch in Mk 6,7 davon die Rede, dass ihnen Jesus Vollmacht über die unreinen Geister verliehen habe. Andererseits mag die Tatsache, dass der Bittsteller sich noch einmal an Jesus wendet, den Leser bereits vermuten lassen, dass der Kranke noch nicht geheilt sein kann.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ J.P. HEIL, *Mark*, 193, ist hier m.E. im Unrecht, wenn er voraussetzt, dass der Leser sich fragt, ob Jesus den Dämon austreiben kann. Eine solche Leserreaktion wäre nur denkbar, wenn man Mk 9,14-29 als isolierte Erzählung betrachten würde.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Zum Motiv des Versagens von Schülern des Wundertäters, vgl. z. B. 2 Kön 4,29-31. Während dort aber das Scheitern des Gehasi ausführlich geschildert ist, wird in Mk 9,14-29 nur auf den misslungenen Versuch der Jünger zurückgeblickt.

Zum Topos des Scheiterns von Ärzten, vgl. z. B. die Beispiele bei KOLLMANN, *Wundertäter*, 213, n. 45.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Sicherlich aufgrund des nicht ganz sicheren Bezuges wird diese Frage in der Forschung kontrovers diskutiert. Einen Bezug auf die Jünger vermuten z. B. J. ERNST, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (RNT 2; Regensburg 1981) 267; SÖDING, *Glaube*, 464, und VAN IERSEL, *Markus*, 178. Dagegen halten es etwa GUNDRY, *Mark*, 489; E. HAENCHEN, *Der Weg Jesu. Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen* (Berlin 1968) 320, und D.R.A. HARE, *Mark* (Westminster Bible Companion; Louisville 1996) 110, für wahrscheinlich, dass die Menge, M.-J. LAGRANGE, *L'Évangile de Saint Marc* (EtB; Paris 1947) 239, oder J. SCHMID, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (RNT 2; Regensburg 1963) 176,

ein Bezug zwischen der Form des Textes und seiner Rezeption durch den Leser deutlich: Zwar wurde V. 19 als "pneumatische Erregung" des Wundertäters bestimmt. Der mangelnde Bezug zum unmittelbaren Kontext sowie auch der beschriebene formale Aufbau signalisieren zusätzlich eine deutliche Distanz Jesu zu seiner Umgebung: Beides erinnert an prophetische Worte⁽⁴⁹⁾ und verleiht — wie die "Epiphanie Jesu" (9,14-25) — der Erzählung eine neue Dimension. Dem Leser, der bereits vermutet, dass es im Folgenden um mehr gehen muss als um eine vordergründig zu interpretierende Wunderheilung, wird mit 9,19 das Signal gegeben, dass im Folgenden die Frage des "Glaubens" bzw. "Unglaubens" eine wichtige Rolle spielen wird. Gleichzeitig wollen auch innermarkinische Bezüge bedacht sein: So war bereits in V. 8,38 von der "eherecherischen und sündigen Generation" die Rede und mag das wiederholte "Wie lange noch?" im Munde Jesu in Erinnerung rufen, dass erst in 8,31 und 9,9 der kommende Tod wie auch die Auferstehung des "Menschensohnes" Jesus prophezeit wurde.

Verse 9,19c-20. Erst mit V. 19c kehrt die Erzählung in die Bahnen eines üblichen Exorzismus zurück. So kann der Leser V. 20 als die erwartete — aussichtslose — Gegenwehr des Dämons gegen den überlegenen Wundertäter einordnen. Die Erwartungen richten sich wiederum auf eine erfolgreiche exorzistische Handlung Jesu.

Verse 9,21-24. Anstelle sich aber gegen den Dämon zu wenden, spricht Jesus — unerwartet — erneut mit dem Vater des Jungen. Auch diese "untypische Einzelheit" konfrontiert den Leser mit dem Problem des *Warum*: Warum ist Jesus so sehr an "medizinischen" Fragen interessiert? Zeigt sich hier eine Unsicherheit des Exorzisten, der erst alle Symptome der Erkrankung wissen muss, um heilend eingreifen zu können? Sind nicht schon in V. 18 alle Details der Krankheit ausführlichst geschildert worden? Ist hier vielleicht die Begründung des Versagens der Jünger zu sehen, die eventuell den Einzelfall nicht genau genug berücksichtigten? Wie verträgt sich dies aber mit dem in 9,19 eingeführten Motiv des Glaubens?

Die Antwort des Vaters (9,22) verleiht der bereits in V. 18 geschilderten Notlage eine tiefere Dimension⁽⁵⁰⁾: Einerseits wird klar,

für richtig, dass alle gemeint seien. PESCH, *Markusevangelium*, II, 90, plädiert dagegen für einen ursprünglichen Bezug auf die Schriftgelehrten.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Vgl. z. B. Num 14,27 als Wort Gottes, Dtn 32,5.20 im Munde des Mose, prophetische Worte wie Jes 6,11; 65,2, Jer 5,23 und andere.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Vgl. hierzu z. B. auch die Ausführungen bei DELORME, "Signification", 536-537.

dass es in diesem Falle um Leben und Tod des Kranken geht. Mindestens genauso wichtig ist aber andererseits, dass der Vater sich nun in die Bitte um Hilfe selbst mit einschließt, allerdings — wohl aus seiner Erfahrung des Jüngerversagens heraus⁽⁵¹⁾ — nur ein stark eingeschränktes Vertrauen in Jesus besitzt. Damit aber kann sich der Leser ihm überlegen fühlen, hat doch er u. a. aus den ersten Kapiteln bereits mehrfach Erfahrung mit der Wunderkraft Jesu gemacht.

Wenn also Jesus seine Rede mit τὸ εἰ δυνῇ einleitet, richtet er seine Aufmerksamkeit genau auf das "Untypische" der Bitte des Vaters, den Punkt also, der auch den Leser am stärksten interessiert. Gleichzeitig transzendiert seine Antwort, die sich ganz offensichtlich *nicht* für die geschilderten Krankheitssymptome interessiert, nun endgültig die bisherige Verstehens Ebene der Erzählung. Dem Leser wird klargemacht, dass es in dieser Sache nicht nur für den Jungen um Leben und Tod geht: Im Mittelpunkt des Interesses steht plötzlich der Vater und sein Verhältnis zu Jesus. V. 23 ist aber wiederum so offen formuliert, dass sich eine neue Frage ergibt: Ist der Glaube des Wundertäters entscheidend *und/oder* der des Bittstellers⁽⁵²⁾?

V. 24 scheint diese Frage zu beantworten: Der sofortige Schrei des Vaters⁽⁵³⁾ mündet in ein ganz außerordentliches Glaubens— wie Unglaubensbekenntnis. Wie ist das Verhältnis zwischen Glauben und Unglauben in diesem Falle zu erklären? Kann hier von einem adäquaten Glauben gesprochen werden?

Verse 9,25-27. Dass Jesus jetzt zur eigentlichen Heilung schreitet, beantwortet diese Frage. Er erkennt diese Glaubensäußerung als adäquat an. Damit aber verändert sich das Verhältnis zwischen Leser und Vater grundlegend: Während sich ersterer noch nach V. 22 dem

(⁵¹) Auch diese Begründung des mangelnden Vertrauens steht nicht explizit im Text, der Leser kann sie aber aus den bisherigen Worten des Vaters folgern.

(⁵²) So halten z. B. GRUNDMANN, *Markus*, 255; LÜHRMANN, *Markus*, 161, und SCHNIEWIND, *Markus*, 125, Jesu Glaube an dieser Stelle für entscheidend, was wiederum ROLOFF, *Kerygma*, 150, und SCHMITHALS, "Heilung", 223, als unwahrscheinlich ablehnen. F. HAHN, "Das Verständnis des Glaubens im Markusevangelium", *Glaube im Neuen Testament* (FS. H. Binder; [Hrsg. F. HAHN – H. KLEIN] BThS 7; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982) 43-67, esp. 58, dagegen spricht davon, dass der Glaube des Vaters entscheidend sei, ERNST, *Markus*, 268, stellt den Bezug zu dem der Jünger her. Beide Komponenten, also den Glauben des Wundertäters wie den des Bittstellers, verbinden z. B. GNILKA, *Markus*, II, 48, und KERTELGE, *Markusevangelium*, 92. MARSHALL, *Faith*, 118-119, hält die entstehende Doppeldeutigkeit m.E. zu Recht für intentional.

(⁵³) Im bisherigen Verlauf des Markusevangeliums wurde das Verbum κράζω übrigens nur für die Laute von Dämonen gebraucht.

Vater überlegen fühlen konnte, muss ihm jetzt klar werden, dass *er* selbst gegenüber Jesus immer in der Rolle eines um *derartige* Hilfe Bittenden sein muss: "Ich (der Leser) *meinte zu glauben, hilf meinem Unglauben*".

Die Aufmerksamkeit richtet sich nun aber auch zurück auf die ursprünglich geschilderte Notlage sowie auf die immer mehr heranrückende Menge⁽⁵⁴⁾: Der zweiteilige Ausfahrbefehl lässt die erfolgte Heilung erwarten. Diese Erwartung bestätigt sich auch durch die folgende "Konstitution des Wunders": Aus Sicht des Lesers hat Jesus den "unreinen Geist" (9,25) besiegt. Diese Perspektive ändert sich auch nicht durch V. 26b, wo davon die Rede ist, dass der Kranke *wie* tot daliegt. Gerade diese kurze Bemerkung hat aber Folgen für die weitere Rezeption des Textes: Einerseits lässt sie erwarten, dass die Handlung Jesu damit noch nicht abgeschlossen ist, andererseits aber verschafft sie dem Leser eine gewisse Überlegenheit über die Perspektive der "Vielen": Diese halten den Jungen nämlich für *wirklich* tot. Als Jesus seine Hand berührt, ihn auf(er)weckt und er schließlich auf(er)steht, ist die Erwartung des Lesers an eine Lösung der Notlage damit erfüllt. Gleichzeitig wird aber durch die Kombination der Begriffe νεκρός, ἀποθνήσκω, ἐγείρω und ἀνίσταμαι wieder der Bezug zu 8,31 und 9,9 wachgerufen: Was vordergründig ein Exorzismus ist, muss hintergründig als Glaubensgeschichte vor dem Hintergrund der Leidens- und Auferstehungsweissagung Jesu verstanden werden.

Verse 9,28-29. Das Fehlen *finaler* Motive wie "Admiration", "Akklamation" o.ä. signalisiert dem Leser nun aber, dass im Gegensatz zu ihm die Menge nicht zu dieser Erkenntnis gekommen ist. Dass die Szene so abrupt wieder zu den Jüngern zurückblendet⁽⁵⁵⁾, ruft ihm aber die eingangs gestellte Frage wieder ins Gedächtnis zurück: Warum konnten die Jünger diesen Dämon nicht austreiben? Die Antwort Jesu ist in mehrerlei Hinsicht erstaunlich: Was meint er mit τοῦτο τὸ γένος⁽⁵⁶⁾? Ist der hier vorliegende Sonderfall besonders schwierig auszutreibender — weil stummer und tauber (9,25) — Dämonen gemeint? Dann wäre

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Auch V. 25 ist erstaunlicherweise wieder aus der Perspektive Jesu geschildert.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Die Tatsache, dass die Jünger gesondert von der Menge eigene Belehrungen erhalten, ist dem Leser nicht ungewohnt. Vgl. z. B. Mk 4,10.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Vgl. hierzu z. B. L. PIROT – R. LECONTE, *Évangile selon Saint Marc* (SB[PC] 9; Paris 1950) 507: "Τοῦτο τὸ γένος, cette expression est susceptible d'une double signification; l'une générale, cette race, les démons, l'autre particulière: cette espèce de démons".

nun sozusagen ein besonderes "Rezept" des Meisters an seiner Schüler zu erwarten. Demgegenüber wirkt aber der Hinweis, dass "diese Art" nur durch Gebet auszutreiben sei, geradezu banal, wird zumindest vor dem geschilderten Erwartungshorizont nicht befriedigen: Kann eine derart komplexe Erzählung in einer solch einfachen Bemerkung enden? Eine letzte Offenheit entsteht, die noch einmal zur Reflexion herausfordert: Was sich mehr und mehr als Glaubensgeschichte interpretieren ließ, muss auch am Schluss als "Glaubensgeschichte" zu verstehen sein⁽⁵⁷⁾: Das Wunder der Überwindung des Bösen, das sich im Verlauf der Erzählung als Wunder der Überwindung der Todesmacht erwies, ist nur in der Haltung eines Glaubens möglich, der sich seiner dauernden Gefährdung durch den Unglauben (9,24) bewusst ist — nicht durch exorzistische Rezepturen. Diese Haltung aber wird nur im Gebet, das auf den in der Überwindung des Bösen eigentlich Handelnden verweist, erreicht und aufrechterhalten.

*
* *

Wie sich anhand der Analyse des Beispieltextes zeigt, bestehen durchaus Verbindungslinien zwischen der form- bzw. motivkritischen Analyse des Beispieltextes und seiner Rezeption durch den Leser. Zwar kann die formkritische Analyse nicht *alleine* als Grundlage zur Bestimmung der Rezeption des Einzeltextes dienen: Dies ist bereits durch die Einbettung des Beispiels in den größeren Kontext des Markusevangeliums, der ja ebenfalls eine entscheidende Bedeutung für das Lesen des Einzeltextes hat, begründet. Trotzdem bestätigen sich die eingangs formulierten Thesen über methodische Verbindungen zwischen formkritischer Analyse und Rezeptionsästhetik:

1. Die "typischen" Motive der "Charakterisierung der Not", der "Gegenwehr des Dämons" wie auch des Einsetzens eines "wunderwirkenden Wortes" wecken Erwartungen an den Verlauf der Erzählung, die z.T. erfüllt, zum größeren Teil aber enttäuscht werden.

2. Das besonders breit formulierte, zweimal begebende Motiv der "Charakterisierung der Not" lenkt einerseits die besondere Aufmerksamkeit auf die Einzigartigkeit des Falles. Andererseits ermöglicht gerade die Ausweitung der Not auf die Person des Vaters die Öffnung des Lesers hin zur Rezeption der Erzählung als "Glaubensgeschichte".

3. Das Fehlen wichtiger finaler Motive erzeugt eine Leerstelle, aus

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Vgl. hierzu v. a. auch die weiterführenden überzeugenden Argumente von SÖDING, *Glaube*, 470-471.

der der Leser das Unverständnis der Menge gegenüber dem Erzählten folgen kann.

4. Mk 9,14-29 fällt durch seine besondere Häufung für die Gattung "Exorzismus" untypischer Elemente auf. So bewirkt v. a. die Verbindung mit der an ungewöhnlichem Ort auftauchenden "Admiration" (9,15), dass das "Kommen des Wundertäters" als "Epiphanie" aufgefasst werden muss. Das "Versagen der Jünger" wirft Fragen auf, die erst am Ende der Erzählung beantwortet werden. Auch die eigenartige "Form" der "pneumatischen Erregung" (9,19) öffnet den Blick auf eine christologische Interpretation der Perikope. Besonders bedeutsam aber ist die Tatsache, dass der "Hilferuf" des Vaters zunächst von einer Äußerung nur eingeschränkten Vertrauens begleitet ist: Erst dies stößt den "untypischen" Dialog an, der die Erzählung zu einer Glaubensgeschichte transzendiert.

Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät
Universität Regensburg
D-93040 Regensburg

Tobias NICKLAS

SUMMARY

The growing discussion about the methodological connections between a synchronic oriented Form-analysis and a diachronic type of Form criticism has in no way resulted in concerns lying behind both methodological approaches being resolved. On the contrary, the crisis of the classical methodological approaches can also open up a perspective on connections that have up to now been insufficiently considered. The present study attempts to demonstrate with the example of Mark 9,14-29 what methodological conclusions result for the question of reader reception from the Form-analysis of a narrative text.

Indicative and Imperative in Matthean Soteriology

In virtually all New Testament scholarship it is believed that, at least to some degree, the relation of the indicative (gift) and imperative (demand) in Matthew constitutes a theological problem for Christians. A spectrum of representative opinion will indicate some of the shades of judgment about this issue.

I. The Perceived Problem

(1) Some scholars contend that Matthew is legalistic⁽¹⁾. Marxsen is typical. He contrasts two types of ethics. On the one hand, if God is conceived as one who sets requirements and makes His relationship with people dependent on their fulfilling these requirements, then the practice of ethics promises realization of the relationship. It is assumed that humans are capable of meeting the admission requirements. On the other hand, if God is conceived as one who has already come to humans with love — without any precondition — then the relationship already exists and humans can act (ethics) — out of gratitude. It is assumed that humans can act rightly only if they are enabled by God's prior act. The former type, Marxsen thinks, is a Pharisaic ethic; the latter, a Christian ethic. Marxsen, moreover, believes that Matthew represents a type one ethic. Matthew's imperative, then, consists of admission requirements for entering the Kingdom of Heaven. He says, further, that to avoid this conclusion, one must demonstrate that Matthew undergirds the imperatives with an indicative that enables the doer to follow the imperatives. He does not believe this can be done⁽²⁾. That is, Matthew's demand/imperative constitutes God's requirement of humans if they are to attain a relationship with Him. There is no prior indicative/gift/grace that bestows a relation, unconditionally, quite apart from human performance and to which human performance can respond.

(¹) B.W. BACON, "Jesus and the Law. A Study of the First 'Book' of Matthew (Mt 3-7)", *JBL* 47 (1928) 203-231, speaks of the 'neo-legalism' of Matthew. H. WINDISCH, *Der Sinn der Bergpredigt* (UNT 16; Leipzig 1937), would fall also into this camp. He sees the Sermon on the Mount as admissions requirements for entering the kingdom of heaven. H. KVALBEIN, "The Kingdom of God in the Ethics of Jesus", *StTh* 51 (1997) 60-84, esp. 79, reflects the same stance.

(²) W. MARXSEN, *New Testament Foundations for Christian Ethics* (Philadelphia 1993) 238.

Marxsen's position is problematic on two counts. On the one hand, Matthew clearly sees getting in Jesus' community as due to divine initiative. The disciples are called (4,18-22) before Jesus gives the Sermon on the Mount. Matt 28,19-20 specifies that the nations are to be made disciples and baptized before they are taught to observe all that Jesus commanded. That the kingdom has been inaugurated in Jesus' ministry (12,28) means that repentance (4,17) is a response to a prior act of God. Matthew is clearly not legalism. A divine indicative enables one's entry into the community of Jesus' disciples. On the other hand, Marxsen represents a perspective on Pharisaic Judaism that is pre-Sanders⁽³⁾ or for that matter pre-Moore⁽⁴⁾. Most modern scholars would regard a Pharisaic ethic not as legalism (in which one gets in the covenant relation by works of law) but as covenantal nomism (in which one gets in the covenant by grace and obeys the law thereafter out of gratitude). To such scholars, Marxsen's description of a type two ethic (= his Christian one) sounds very much like the covenantal nomism modern scholars associate with Pharisaic Judaism. The issue of Matthew's ethic is better focused by certain other scholars, e.g. Eskola⁽⁵⁾ and Laato⁽⁶⁾, as whether or not Matthew represents legalistic covenantal nomism (in which one gets in the covenant relation by grace and then stays in it and gets in the Age to Come by works of law). This legalistic covenantal nomism is seen in contrast to a new covenant piety in which God or Christ or the Holy Spirit enables one to be obedient in an ongoing way after one's having gotten in the relation. That is, in new covenant piety one gets in the relation by grace and stays in the covenant relation by grace and gets into the Age to Come by grace. In this view, the life of a disciple is by grace from start to finish. This grace is not a substitute for obedience to God's will but is the enablement of it. The question to be pursued must be refined beyond Marxsen's statement of it. Properly put the issue is: does Matthew see the imperative as admissions requirements, either initially into Jesus' community or ultimately into the Age to Come, that humans must meet in order to gain

(3) E.P. SANDERS, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. A comparison of Patterns of Religion (Philadelphia 1983); ID., *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia 1985).

(4) G.F. MOORE, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. The Age of the Tannaim (Cambridge 1927-1930) I-III.

(5) T. ESKOLA, "Paul, Predestination and Covenantal Nomism — Reassessing Paul and Palestinian Judaism", *JSJ* 28 (1997) 390-412; id., *Theodicy and Predestination in Pauline Soteriology* (WUNT 2.100; Tübingen 1998).

(6) T. LAATO, *Paul and Judaism*. An Anthropological Approach (SFSHJ 115; Atlanta 1995).

either or both of these benefits? Most scholars today believe that entry into Jesus' community is by grace for the reasons cited above. The current debate is over what follows in the disciple's life. Is there an indicative that underlies and enables fulfillment of the imperative in disciples' lives after their entry into the community of Jesus?

(2) Other scholars believe Matthew reflects covenantal nomism. That is, Matthew is believed to employ an indicative/grace for the disciple to get in the relationship but is believed to have no developed notion of grace for staying in or for getting in the Age to Come. Luomanen⁽⁷⁾ and Syreeni⁽⁸⁾ are representatives of this stance. They each speak of Matthew as reflecting a defective covenantal nomism. Since Luomanen's work is more comprehensive, we focus on it. He contends that Matthew wanted to understand Jesus' proclamation within the framework of traditional covenantal nomism and so pass it on to his Jewish contemporaries. There are differences, of course, between Matthew's content and that of non-Christian Judaism, but from a structural point of view Matthew has much in common with covenantal nomism. God's election forms the starting point. This grace enables one's getting in the people of God. It remains a presupposition, however, that is not spelt out. Jesus' atonement, which is restricted to staying in rather than to inclusion, functions very much as sacrifice did in non-Christian Jewish covenantal nomism. This is an aid to one's staying in. It is part of the synergism of staying in and getting in the Age to Come. This position is subject to the criticisms of people like Eskola and Laato who regard synergism in the post-entry period as legalistic covenantal nomism. If Matthew represents covenantal nomism, then the indicative sees to one's getting in but is not solely responsible for one's staying in or for getting in the Age to Come.

(3) Another group of scholars believe Matthew has both an indicative and an imperative but that the former does not control the latter. At least three shades of opinion must be noted. Some see the imperative as explicit in Matthew but regard the indicative as only implicit. Mohrlang⁽⁹⁾ and Meyer⁽¹⁰⁾ are two representatives of this shade

(7) P. LUOMANEN, *Entering the Kingdom of Heaven. A Study on the Structure of Matthew's View of Salvation* (WUNT 2.101; Tübingen 1998).

(8) K. SYREENI, *The Making of the Sermon on the Mount. A procedural analysis of Matthew's redactional activity* (AASF.DHL 44; Helsinki 1987).

(9) R. MOHRLANG, *Matthew and Paul. A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives* (MSSNTS 48; Cambridge 1984).

(10) B.F. MEYER, *Five Speeches that Changed the World* (Collegeville 1994) 47.

of opinion. Since Mohrlang's work is the more comprehensive we will focus on his views. He is concerned with the question of how the concept of grace enters into Matthew's understanding of ethics. He summarizes:

Matthew does not exploit this assumed structure of grace, and does not build his ethics explicitly upon it (rarely is ethical behavior motivated by considerations of grace); for the most part, it remains in the background, simply taken for granted — the largely unspoken context in which the Gospel is set⁽¹¹⁾.

Second and third summary statements add clarification. The first: 'The concept of Jesus' continuing presence with the community is as little explicitly integrated with the evangelist's ethics as his view of the Spirit' ⁽¹²⁾. The second: Matthew's Gospel with its emphasis on demand and obedience results in a Gospel 'almost totally devoid of explicit reference to God's aid in the moral-ethical realm' ⁽¹³⁾. For these scholars, only the imperative is explicit; the indicative is merely implicit.

Others believe both indicative and imperative are present in Matthew but that the link between them is not clearly spelled out. Luz is an example ⁽¹⁴⁾. The indicative and imperative are there. The miracle stories, for example, have a central function of announcing salvation (= the indicative) in the earthly career of Jesus. It is not the kerygma of the death and resurrection of Jesus that conveys the indicative in Matthew, however; it is rather the abiding presence of Jesus in the community. Jesus' ethics constitute the imperative ⁽¹⁵⁾. Both components, indicative and imperative, stand together. Their relationship does not seem clearly defined, however. It is not clear how demand and gift belong together. This is a weakness in Matthew's theology ⁽¹⁶⁾.

Seeley argues that Matthew contains multiple perspectives that cannot be blended into a smooth unity ⁽¹⁷⁾. On the one hand, there is the claim that Jesus' atoning death provides salvation. Jesus is the one who brings salvation. On the other hand, there is a focus on Jesus as the spokesman who describes a way of life to be followed. Salvation in

⁽¹¹⁾ MOHRLANG, *Matthew and Paul*, 80.

⁽¹²⁾ MOHRLANG, *Matthew and Paul*, 112.

⁽¹³⁾ MOHRLANG, *Matthew and Paul*, 114.

⁽¹⁴⁾ U. LUZ, "The Disciples in the Gospel according to Matthew", *The Interpretation of Matthew* (ed. G. STANTON) (Studies in New Testament Interpretation; Edinburgh 1995) 115-148.

⁽¹⁵⁾ LUZ, "The Disciples", 129-130.

⁽¹⁶⁾ LUZ, "The Disciples", 132-133.

⁽¹⁷⁾ D. SEELEY, *Deconstructing the New Testament* (Biblical Interpretation Series 5; Leiden 1994) 21-52.

this perspective does not involve Jesus. It takes place between a person and God the Father. Whether it occurs or not depends on the person's own initiative. There is no need for Jesus' atoning death. Jesus is, however, the End-time judge who decides on the basis of a person's deeds in this life. There is nothing that would lead one to see the first perspective as the underlying structure embracing all else. So in Matthew, the emphasis on the law is very much at odds with the parts of Matthew that focus on Jesus as redeemer. Matthew never consolidates these two portraits of Jesus presented by the building blocks he used. 'We can see Matthew wrestling with his traditions, and we can see them wrestling back. In this case, they seem to have won the match' ⁽¹⁸⁾. Matthew never quite brings the two, the indicative and the imperative, together. 'They are ... there, like an unharmonious choir demanding to be heard' ⁽¹⁹⁾.

(4) Yet another group of scholars see indicative and imperative as present in Matthew and attempt to explain how the indicative has priority. Frankemölle ⁽²⁰⁾ and Kupp ⁽²¹⁾ are representative of this stance. Both affirm that the concept of Jesus' presence with the disciples, rooted in the Old Testament view of God's compassionate and caring presence among His people, is Matthew's leading idea. Out of the God-with-us theme Matthew's entire plot is constituted. The expressions 'with us/you' and 'in your midst' are synonyms in both OT and in Matthew ⁽²²⁾. Over one hundred occurrences of this formula are found in the OT, mostly in the historical books and mostly with individuals, though sometimes with the whole people. The formula mostly drops out of use in post-biblical Judaism. The formula signals empowerment of God's people. This formula applied to Jesus (1,23; 18,20; 28,19-20) is part of Matthew's christology which makes possible his soteriology ⁽²³⁾. This is a significant advance toward understanding the relation of indicative and imperative in Matthew. It enables one to see how God is present in Jesus; how Jesus is present with the disciples or in their midst; how this presence enables both

⁽¹⁸⁾ SEELEY, *Deconstructing the New Testament*, 52.

⁽¹⁹⁾ SEELEY, *Deconstructing the New Testament*, 52.

⁽²⁰⁾ H. FRANKEMÖLLE, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi* (NTA 10; Münster 1974); ID., *Matthäus* (Düsseldorf 1997) II, 552-560. His influence is seen in S. GRASSO, *Il Vangelo di Matteo* (CBi; Roma 1995) 683.

⁽²¹⁾ D.D. KUPP, *Matthew's Emmanuel*. Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel (MSSNTS 90; Cambridge 1996).

⁽²²⁾ FRANKEMÖLLE, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi*, 32.

⁽²³⁾ KUPP, *Matthew's Emmanuel*, 220.

church discipline (18,20) and mission (28,20). On at least these two fronts the indicative is clearly prior to the imperative and God's grace explicitly enables His people's obedient response in the period subsequent to their entry into Jesus' community. In the form in which it is presented, however, the proposed quilt is too small to cover the whole Matthean bed. Where, for example, is the indicative that covers ethical activity of the disciple? More work needs to be done in the direction these scholars are pointing.

It is usually thought, then, that Matthew emphasizes the imperative at the expense of the indicative, demand over gift. If one wanted to try to falsify this perception, what would be necessary? Two things at least! First, one would need to identify Matthew's indicative, if there is one. Second, one would need to show how this indicative, if there is one, controls Matthew's imperative. In the pages that follow these two points will be pursued. We begin with the first.

II. Identifying Matthew's Indicative

How would one recognize Matthew's indicative, if there is one? It seems obvious that Matthew does not operate in the Pauline conceptual world (e.g., divine indwelling). Could it be that there are other conceptual worlds besides those used by Paul for speaking about divine enablement of human activity? If so, then the failure to recognize Matthew's indicative may be due to the reader's failure to recognize the First Evangelist's conceptual repertoire. It is my contention that Matthew has a strong indicative if one knows where to look. In attempting to clarify Matthew's conceptual world we will need to indicate both (1) the type of narrative approach he uses and (2) at least some of the techniques employed in such a type of approach. We begin with the former: the type of narrative approach used.

Matthew begins and ends his Gospel with narratives that attest repeated divine inbreaks into human affairs. Here God very much has the initiative and humans respond. For example, the birth narratives begin with a miraculous conception of Jesus (1,18) about which Joseph is reassured by an angel of the Lord (1,20-21). The wise men from the East are directed to Jesus by a miraculous star (2,2) and are sent on their way by a warning in a dream (2,12). Joseph is warned by an angel of the Lord to flee to Egypt (2,13). After Herod's death an angel tells Joseph it is safe to return to Israel (2,19-20). At the end of the Gospel, when Jesus dies the earth shakes, rocks are split, and many

bodies of saints are raised and appear to many in Jerusalem (27,51-53). In connection with the stories of Jesus' resurrection, there is a great earthquake and an angel descends from heaven, rolls back the stone from before the tomb (28,2), frightens the soldiers nearly to death (28,4), and tells the women that Jesus has been raised (28,6). The beginning and ending of the First Gospel are full of explicit divine interventions into human affairs. The main body of the Gospel that contains the five big teaching sections (Matt 5-25) is narrated in a very different way. Especially when the text concerns disciples' obedience to the teachings of Jesus, divine intervention appears to be either absent or well hidden in the background. Hence the problem about the indicative and the imperative in the First Gospel. There are different ways to explain such shifts in the narrative.

Von Rad attempts to understand the different types of approach to God's action in history in OT narrative by setting up a dichotomy between an early view and a later one. The older idea of God's action in history involved YHWH's immediate visible and audible intervention (e.g., Gen 28,17; similar to the beginning and ending of Matthew's Gospel). A later idea dispenses with any outwardly perceptible influence of YHWH on history. God's guidance comes in hidden ways (e.g., the narrative of the wooing of Rebecca, the Joseph stories, Ruth, the history of the succession to David; more like Matt 5-25). A new way of picturing YHWH's action in history led to a new technique in narrative.

For an era which no longer experienced Yahweh's working mainly in the sacral form of miracles ... could therefore no longer satisfactorily express its faith in a sacral narrative-form ... Nature and History ... became secularized, and was as it were, overnight released from the sacral orders sheltering it. In consequence, the figures in stories now move in a completely demythologized and secular world ... In order to show Yahweh at work, these story-tellers have no need of wonders or the appearance of charismatic leaders — events develop apparently in complete accord with their own inherent character⁽²⁴⁾.

Psychological processes (e.g., Saul's love-hate relation with David) dominate in a world that has gotten into the habit of looking on human affairs in such a secular way⁽²⁵⁾.

Sternberg is surely right, however, when he notes that in the Hebrew Bible the books mix overt and implicit guidance by God⁽²⁶⁾. The difference in style is due not to a historical development in the

⁽²⁴⁾ G. VON RAD, *Old Testament Theology* (Edinburgh 1962), I, 52-53.

⁽²⁵⁾ VON RAD, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 56.

⁽²⁶⁾ M. STERNBERG, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington 1985) 106.

way God's activity in the world was seen but to a 'compositional alternative of treatment, in the interests of plotting and variety' (27). Take Genesis for example. In Genesis one starts out with: God said, and it was so. This has a long-range effect on one's perceptual set.

It develops a first impression of a world controlled by a prime mover and coherent to the exclusion of accident. Reinforced at strategic junctures by later paradigms and variants, it also enables the narrative to dispense with the continual enactment of divine intervention that would hamper suspense and overschematize the whole plot (28).

This way of dealing with the divine activity (indicative) he calls 'omnipotence behind the scenes'. It is seen at work, for example, in the stories about Joseph and about David's accession to the throne. In the NT, other scholars have seen the same technique at work in the activities of Paul in Acts 23–28, for example (29). I would suggest, then, that what is to be looked for are techniques that are appropriate to a narrative style that often deals in 'omnipotence behind the scenes'. It is this type of narrative that one encounters in Matt 5–25, insofar as disciples are concerned. It is, therefore, for techniques that allow the evangelist to speak in terms of 'omnipotence behind the scenes' that one is to search.

There are at least four techniques, about which I know, that fit such a method of narration and that are found in Matthew. They may be summarized as: (1) I am with you/in your midst; (2) invoking the divine name; (3) it has been revealed to you/you have been given to know; and (4) being with Jesus. Each of these devices will need to be examined in order.

(1) Let us begin with the formula 'with you' or 'in your midst', a technique of speaking about divine enablement that has already been the subject of some discussion in New Testament circles. The definitive work on the formula itself was done by van Unnik in 1959 (30). He

(27) STERNBERG, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 106.

(28) STERNBERG, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 105.

(29) On Acts, see R. TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*. II. The Acts of the Apostles (Foundations & Facets; Minneapolis 1990) 294, and C.H. TALBERT – J.H. HAYES, "A Theology of Sea Storms in Luke-Acts", *Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers* (ed. E.H. LOVERING, Jr.) (Atlanta 1995) 333. Behind 1 Sam 17–2 Sam 5 there is the same 'omnipotence behind the scenes': cf. 1 Sam 18,12,14 (the Lord was 'with David'); 2 Sam 5,10 (David became great because the Lord was 'with him').

(30) W.C. VAN UNNIK, "Dominus Vobiscum: The Background of a Liturgical Formula", *New Testament Essays* (FS. T.W. Manson [ed. A.J.B. HIGGINS])

examined the more than one hundred passages using this formula in the LXX and grouped them in about six categories⁽³¹⁾. He noted that the formula is found rarely in Psalms and prophets but frequently in the historical books (in narrative!). It is used mostly with individuals but sometimes with the nation. It involves the empowering or enablement of someone or some group involved in a divine task. Certain early Christian writers also used the formula (e.g., Luke 1,28; Acts 7,9-10; 10,38; 18,9-10; John 3,2; 8,29; 14,16-17; 16,32; Rom 15,33; 2 Cor 13,11; Phil 4,9; 2 Thess 3,16; 1 Cor 14,25; 2 Tim 4,22; Matt 1,23; 28,20; 18,20). Josephus and Philo, however, do not retain the formula. Later Jewish exegetical material, moreover, does not use the phrase as the OT did. One of the most interesting observations made in this essay by van Unnik is about the connection between this formula and the Spirit. The relation between God's 'being with' someone and the Spirit's involvement is too frequent to be accidental⁽³²⁾. Consider these examples: Joseph (God was with Joseph [Gen 39,23]; God's Spirit was in Joseph [Gen 41,38]); Moses (God will be with Moses [Exod 3,12]; the Spirit is upon Moses [Num 11,17]); Joshua (God will be with Joshua [Josh 3,7]; Joshua was full of the Spirit [Deut 34,9]); Gideon (God is with Gideon [Judg 6,12]; 'the Spirit of the Lord took possession of Gideon' [Judg 6,34]); Saul ('God is with you' [1 Sam 10,7]; 'the Spirit will come upon you' [1 Sam 10,6]); David (the Lord was with David [1 Sam 18,12.14]; 'the Spirit came upon David' [1 Sam 16,13]); Israel ('I am with you' [Hag 2,4]; 'my Spirit abides among you' [Hag 2,5]); Jesus ('God was with him'; God anointed him with the Spirit [Acts 10,38]); Mary ('the Lord is with you' [Luke 1,28]; 'the Holy Spirit will come upon you' [Luke 1,35]); Jesus' disciples ('to be with you' [John 14,16]; Spirit 'dwells with you and in you' [14,17]); church at Corinth (one convicted declares God is among them because of prophecy which is a manifestation of the Spirit [1 Cor 14,24-25]). Van Unnik concludes that the expression 'with you' refers to the dynamic activity of God's Spirit enabling people to do God's work by protecting, assisting, and blessing them⁽³³⁾. Given this background, one would have to conclude that when

London 1959) 270-305. Cf. also M. GÖRG, "Ich bin mit Dir: Gewicht und Anspruch einer Redeform im Alten Testament", *ThGl* 70 (1980) 214-40, who wants to classify the phrase's use in three categories: (1) God's promises to someone; (2) a statement about someone; (3) a blessing on someone.

⁽³¹⁾ For a full list of references, see VAN UNNIK, "Dominus Vobiscum", 300-301, n. 37.

⁽³²⁾ VAN UNNIK, "Dominus Vobiscum", 286.

⁽³³⁾ VAN UNNIK, "Dominus Vobiscum", 293.

Matthew uses the formula 'with you' or 'in your midst' he is speaking of God's prior enabling activity (= the indicative), activity that empowers those to whom it applies to do the tasks set before them. It also may explain why Matthew's discussion of the Spirit is so under-developed. This formula (with you/in your midst) was an alternative, but less explicit, way of speaking of God's activity among His people.

In Matthew scholars have frequently noted the use of the phrase 'with you' or 'in your midst' in three texts: 1,23; 18,20; and 28,20. The first (1,23) says the name of the one to be born will be 'called Emmanuel (which means, God with us)'. This is Matthew's controlling image when speaking of the divine presence in Jesus. The ripple effect of this statement is seen throughout the Gospel: for example, 3,17 (the voice from heaven at the baptism); 8,23-27 ('what sort of man is this?'); 12,6 ('something greater than the temple is here'); 12,18 ('I will put my Spirit upon him'); 14,32-33 ('those in the boat worshipped him'); 9,8 and 15,29-31 (after Jesus' acts, God is glorified); 17,5 (the voice from heaven at the transfiguration); 21,9 and 23,39 ('the one who comes in the name of the Lord'); 28,9.17 ('worshipped him'). The auditor is never allowed to forget that when Jesus is active God is present. What Jesus does and says, God is doing and saying through him. In Matthew, Jesus mediates the divine presence; he is God with us.

There are more 'with us' phrases in Matthew than the remaining two (18,20 and 28,20). They may be grouped in terms of where they fit on a time line in salvation history. Regarding Jesus' earthly life, consider the following: 9,15 ('can the wedding guests fast while the bridegroom is with them?'); 17,17 ('how long am I to be with you?'⁽³⁴⁾); 26,11 ('you do not always have me [with you]'); 26,18 ('keep the Passover with my disciples'); 26,20 ('he sat at table with the twelve disciples'); 26,36 ('Jesus went with them' to Gethsemane)⁽³⁵⁾. For the period between Jesus' resurrection and parousia there are the oft noticed duo: 18,20 ('where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them'); 28,20 ('I am with you always, to the close of the age'). For the period of the Age to Come there is 26,29 ('I shall not drink again until that day when I drink

⁽³⁴⁾ Whereas Mark 9,19 has πρὸς, Matt 17,17 has μετά to correspond with the motif elsewhere.

⁽³⁵⁾ M.E. BORING, "Matthew", *New Interpreter's Bible* (Nashville 1995), VIII, 356, notes: Matthew understands his narrative to 'work at two levels, both portraying the pre-Easter story and being transparent to the post-Easter situation. Thus the disciples are already addressed as though they live in the time after Easter'.

it new with you in my Father's kingdom'). In Matthew's schema, when Jesus is with the disciples, God is present with them⁽³⁶⁾. Moreover, in most cases the presence is obviously an enabling one⁽³⁷⁾. This is one way that the First Evangelist speaks about divine enablement of the disciples. It is subtle and can be missed very easily if one has not first been sensitized by the evidence from the OT background.

(2) A second technique that is employed by the First Evangelist to speak about divine enablement of disciples (= the indicative) is associated with 'the name'. In the Scriptures of Israel the name was considered part of the personality⁽³⁸⁾. So the name is used interchangeably with the person (Ps 7,17; 9,10; 18,49; 68[67],4; 74[73],18; 86[85],12; 92[91],1; Isa 25,1; 26,8; 30,27-28; 56,6; Mal 3,16; also in the NT — Acts 1,15; 5,41; 18,15; Rev 3,4; 11,13; 3 John 7; Matt 6,9)⁽³⁹⁾.

The OT used the name as a way of speaking about the presence of God involved with humans. For example, when one swears (1 Sam 20,42; Lev 19,12), curses (2 Kgs 2,24), or blesses (2 Sam 6,18), invoking the name of YHWH, the name thus pronounced evokes YHWH's presence, attention, and active intervention⁽⁴⁰⁾. Or again, the name of YHWH is said to assist humans: Ps 54(53),1 (in response to prayer, where name is used in synonymous parallelism with might/power [cf. Jer 10,6]); Ps 89(88),24 (where God's steadfast love's being with him is used in synonymous parallelism with in my name shall his horn be exalted); Ps 20(19),1 (in response to prayer, where name is used together with God's protection [cf. Prov 18,10]). The same motif of divine assistance is found in the NT related to the name of Jesus: 1 Cor 6,11 (where the name of the Lord Jesus is used in parallelism with the Spirit of God and the two are credited with the converts' being washed, sanctified, and justified); Acts 4,12 (where we are saved only through the name of Jesus); Acts 10,43 (where forgiveness comes in his name); 1 John 5,13 (where eternal life comes

⁽³⁶⁾ G. BRAUMANN, "Mit euch, Matth 26:29", *ThZ* 21 (1965) 161-169.

⁽³⁷⁾ D. VETTER, *Jahwes Mit-Sein — ein Ausdruck des Segens* (AzTh 1/45; Stuttgart 1971), 32, n. 27, starts with Pedersen's contention that the 'expression that Yahweh ... is with one is only another term for the blessing' (J. PEDERSEN, *Israel. Its Life and Culture. I-II* [London 1946-1947] 194), and attempts to validate the claim, successfully, I think. If so, then for YHWH to bless one is equivalent to God's being with that one. Both refer to the divine power within a person or people that issues in success.

⁽³⁸⁾ H. BIETENHARD, "ὄνομα", *TDNT* V, 243.

⁽³⁹⁾ *Ibid.*, 257.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ *Ibid.*, 255

through his name); Mark 9,39 (where mighty works are in his name); Acts 3,6 (where the lame man is told to walk 'in the name of Jesus'; cf. Acts 9,34 — where the language is 'Jesus Christ heals you', walk, indicating the interchangeability of name and person); Acts 4,7 ('by what name or power do you do this?'); Rom 10,13 (where those who 'call on the name of the Lord [Christ] will be saved').

In the NT one meets the phrase 'to be baptized in the name of'. Three different prepositions are used in such phrases for 'in': for example, Acts 2,38 (ἐπί); Acts 10,48 (ἐν); and Acts 8,16; 19,5; 1 Cor 1,13, 15; Matt 28,19 (εἰς). Although Heitmüller thought there was a difference between ἐν and ἐπί on the one hand and εἰς on the other⁽⁴¹⁾, the three prepositions do not seem to offer significantly different meanings (cf., e.g., Justin Mart., *Apol.* 61.3, who uses ἐπ' ὀνόματος with his trinitarian formula whereas Matt uses εἰς)⁽⁴²⁾. Generally speaking, 'in the name of' conveys the meaning 'under the authority of', or 'with the invocation of'. Given its background/roots, however, it can also carry the connotations of 'in the presence of' ('name' and 'presence' are concepts that are interchangeable; cf. Ps 89,24; 1 Cor 6,11) and/or 'in the power of' ('name' and 'power' are parallel concepts; cf. Ps 54,1; Acts 4,7)⁽⁴³⁾. Since name and person are interchangeable (cf. Acts 3,6 with 9,34), moreover, there does not seem to be any significant difference between being baptized in/into the name of Christ and being baptized into Christ.

Matt 28,19-20 indicates that evangelization involves new disciples' being baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. At least three inferences may be drawn. In the first place, certainly implied is that such a one is in a relation of belonging to/being under the authority of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This bonding is reflected in Matt 10,40 ('whoever receives you receives me, and whoever receives me receives Him who sent me'); in Matt 18,5 ('whoever receives one such child in my name receives me'); and in Matt 25,31-46 ('as you did it to the least of these [followers of

⁽⁴¹⁾ W. HEITMÜLLER, "In Namen Jesu". Eine sprach-u. religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament, speziell zur altchristlichen Taufe (FRLANT 2; Göttingen 1903). Heitmüller thought the εἰς derived from banking and so meant 'become the property of'.

⁽⁴²⁾ L. HARTMAN, "Into the Name of the Lord Jesus". Baptism in the Early Church (Studies of the New Testament and its world; Edinburgh 1997) 38-45; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul. A Study in Pauline Theology* (Oxford 1964) 19-23.

⁽⁴³⁾ BIETENHARD, "ὄνομα", 271.

Christ]⁽⁴⁴⁾, you did it to me'). This cannot be all that is implied, however. In the second place, Matt 18,20 shows that the invocation of Jesus' name evokes his presence among the disciples. By extension, whenever the disciples pray the 'Our Father' (6,9-13), the invocation of the name of the Father would evoke His presence in and provision for the disciples' lives (including leading not into temptation and delivering from the Evil One). To invoke the name of God unleashes the power that makes intelligible the words, 'with God nothing is impossible' (19,26). In the third place, there is at least the possibility and perhaps the probability that the First Evangelist understood Christian baptism in terms of Matt 3,11 ('he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit')⁽⁴⁵⁾. If so, then the Spirit's presence is presumed by Matthew to be a part of the disciples' lives to enable them⁽⁴⁶⁾. To be baptized into the Triune Name, therefore, is to enter into a bonded relationship that will provide one with the divine resources to enable one's following the guidance of what comes next (= all that I have commanded you). This is a second technique used by the First Evangelist to indicate the indicative in disciples' lives after their entry into the community of Jesus.

(3) A third technique employed by the First Evangelist to indicate the divine indicative/gift/grace in the lives of Jesus' disciples is associated with the concept of revelation by the Father and/or Jesus to them. In Matt 11,25-27, in a context of chapters 11-13 where the focus is on revelation and concealment⁽⁴⁷⁾, the Matthean Jesus offers thanks to his Father that He has revealed 'these things' to babes rather than to the wise. In light of the previous paragraph (11,20-24), 'these things' must refer to the kingdom's breaking in through the ministry of Jesus (so eschatological secrets having to do with the divine plan of salvation for the world). The larger context would indicate, moreover, that the 'babes'

⁽⁴⁴⁾ S.W. GRAY, *The Least of These My Brothers, Matthew 25:31-46*. A History of Interpretation (SBLDS 114; Atlanta 1989).

⁽⁴⁵⁾ HARTMAN, *"Into the Name of the Lord Jesus"*, 153, thinks this is how Matthew likely understood Christian baptism. So also J.A. OVERMAN, *Church and Community in Crisis*. The Gospel according to Matthew (New Testament in Context; Valley Forge 1996) 409, says that in baptism in the name of the Spirit, John's prophecy of 3,11 is fulfilled.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ B. CHARETTE, *Restoring Presence*. The Spirit in Matthew's Gospel (Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 18; Sheffield 2000) 137.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ C. DEUTSCH, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke*. Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11,25-30 (JSNTSS 18; Sheffield 1987) 42; F.T. GENCH, *Wisdom in the Christology of Matthew* (Lanham 1997) 95.

are Jesus' disciples. Then Jesus states that 'no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal Him'. The second part of this statement portrays Jesus as the one with a knowledge of heavenly mysteries and as the one who can reveal them to others. Two backgrounds have been proposed as an aid to understanding this text. The first is wisdom. Just as God knows wisdom (Job 28,12-27; Sir 1,6-9; Bar 3,32), so also the Father knows the Son. Just as wisdom knows God (Wis 8,4; 9,1-18), so the Son knows the Father. Just as wisdom makes known the divine mysteries (Wis 9,1-18; 10,10), so also Jesus reveals God's hidden truth. Just as wisdom calls people to take up her yoke and find rest (Sir 51,23-30), so Jesus extends a similar invitation⁽⁴⁸⁾. The second is the Teacher of Righteousness. The similarity with the Teacher of Righteousness at Qumran has been noted at least since the 1950's⁽⁴⁹⁾. God has disclosed the mysteries to the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab vii 4-5; 1QH xii [=iv] 27-28) and he has disclosed them to many others (1QH xii [=iv] 27-28; 1QH x [=ii] 13-18). In both cases the revelation has to do with the proper understanding of the eschatological moment. This, the Matthean Jesus' disciples have been given by the Son. Both sets of comparative materials enable one to read the Matthean text in light of ancient Jewish thought. The two sides of the revelatory focus are treated in Matthew in other texts.

This theme of revelation comes up again in Matt 13. Here the focus is on the revelatory function of the Son. In 13,11-12 Jesus tells his disciples:

To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven (...). For to him who has will more be given, and he will have abundance (cf. 13,16-17).

The latter part of the statement surely points to a post-Easter setting when the revelation will continue. In 13,16-17 Jesus says to them:

Blessed are your eyes for they see, and your ears, for they hear. Truly, I say to you, many prophets and righteous men longed to see what you see, and did not see it, and to hear what you hear, and did not hear it⁽⁵⁰⁾.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ M.E. BORING, "Matthew", 274.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ E.g., W.D. DAVIES, "Knowledge in the DSS and Matthew 11:25-30", *HThReview* 46 (1953) 113-139.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ If 'blessing' is the equivalent to 'being with' in biblical thought, as Pedersen and Vedder contend (see n. 37), then the language of blessing associated with the revelation to the disciples in 13,11-12.16-17 speaks of their divine empowering; cf. also 16,17.

The disciples are recipients of revelation. In 13,23 the good soil is interpreted to mean the one 'who hears the word and understands it ... (and) bears fruit'. (Note: Mark 4,20 has 'hear the word and accept it'; Luke 8,15 has 'holds it fast in an honest and good heart'; only Matt 13,23 has 'understands it'.) So the understanding is given by Jesus to the disciples and it produces fruit. That is, the revelation is empowering, enabling in their daily lives. The emphasis on 'understanding' continues to the end of the section on parables. In 13,51, only in Matthew does Jesus ask the disciples: 'Have you understood all this?' They answer: 'Yes'. The Son has made his revelation to them and it has been effective/enabling/ empowering. They will bear fruit as good soil.

That the Father knows the Son was the first part of the sentence in 11,27. The Son's revelation to the disciples has been confirmed in Matt 13. Now several passages indicate the Father's role in the revelatory process as well. In 15,13 Jesus says: 'Every plant which my heavenly Father has not planted will be rooted up. Let them alone; they are blind guides'. The reference is to scribes and Pharisees. The language contrasts these 'wise ones' with the disciples/babes. There are echoes of the parable of the weeds among the wheat (13,24-30). The blind ones are planted not by the Father but the enemy. They are to be left alone until the judgment. They have not been given the revelation. In 16,16-17 Peter makes his confession: 'You are the Christ, the Son of the living God'. Jesus responds: 'Blessed are you [remember 13,16] ... flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven'. The Father knows the Son and has revealed his identity to Peter. In 17,5-6, on the mount of transfiguration, a voice comes from heaven to the three disciples: 'This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased; listen to him'. This echoes an earlier declaration (to John the Baptist at least) at the baptism in 3,17: 'This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased'. One more passage attests the Father's role in revelation. In 7,1-12 we find a thought unit that makes two main points. First, vv. 1-5 contend that one should not judge others until having first judged oneself. Second, vv. 6-12 affirm that it is necessary to discern between good and bad (v. 6), that this may be done with wisdom gained from God through prayer (vv. 7-11), and that any judgments made as a result should be in line with the golden rule (v. 12)⁽⁵¹⁾. In this text, moral

⁽⁵¹⁾ W.D. DAVIES – D.C. ALLISON, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (ICC; Edinburgh 1988) I, 626-627, 667-691.

discernment is the result of prayer to the disciples' Father in heaven. One should remember that such insight is considered empowering by Matthew, as is the invocation of the Father's name! In sum: a third technique used by the First Evangelist to indicate his involvement of omnipotence behind the scenes in the enablement of Jesus' disciples is associated with the concept of revelation — by Jesus and by the Father. There is yet another!

(4) The fourth technique employed by Matthew to point to the divine indicative in the lives of Jesus' followers is linked to the notion of their being 'with Jesus'. Writings of this period speak of four types of teachers with adult followers: (1) philosophers (e.g., Socrates); (2) sages (e.g., Sirach); (3) interpreters of Jewish law (e.g., scribes, Pharisees, Essenes); (4) prophets or seers (e.g., John the Baptist; the Egyptian Jew mentioned by Josephus, *Bell. iud.* 2.261-273; *Ant.* 20.169-172; Acts 21,38)⁽⁵²⁾. When auditors of Matthew's Gospel heard the story of Jesus and his followers, into which of these categories would they have unconsciously slotted Jesus and the disciples?

The overall picture of Jesus and his disciples in Matthew can be sketched with about four strokes of a brush. In the First Gospel Jesus gathers followers, either through a summons (4,18-22; 9,9) or attraction (4,23-25). They follow him (4,20,22; 4,25; 9,9). They are with him (the Twelve: 'Jesus took with him Peter and James and John' [17,1]; 'one of those with Jesus' [26,51]; 'you were with Jesus' [26,69]; 'this man was with Jesus' [26,71]; the crowds: they have been with Jesus three days [15,32]). They derive benefit from his company (crowds: healings [4,25]; healing [8,1-4]; tax collectors and sinners accepted [9,10]; feeding [14,13-20]; healing [19,2]; the Twelve: safety in a storm [8,23]; eschatological benefits promised [19,27-29]; vision of Jesus and message from heaven [17,1-8]).

For a Mediterranean auditor of this Gospel, the closest analogy to Jesus and his disciples would have been a philosopher and his disciples. The four strokes with which the Gospel paints Jesus and his followers would have seemed familiar from depictions of philosophers in antiquity⁽⁵³⁾. (i) Philosophers gathered disciples either by summons (e.g., Aristophanes, *Nu.* 505, has Socrates tell Strepsiades to 'follow me'; Diogenes Laertius, *Vit.* 2.48, tells of Socrates meeting Xenophon

⁽⁵²⁾ P. PERKINS, *Jesus as Teacher* (Understanding Jesus Today; Cambridge 1990) 1-22.

⁽⁵³⁾ V.K. ROBBINS, *Jesus the Teacher. A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia 1984) 89-105, offers further data.

and saying 'follow me' and learn) or by attraction (Flavius Philostratus Soph., *Vita Apol.* 1.19, says Damis was drawn to Apollonius). (ii) A philosopher's disciples followed him (e.g., *ibid.*, 1.19, has Damis say to Apollonius: 'Let us depart ... you following God, and I you'; *ibid.*, 4.25, has Demetrius of Corinth follow Apollonius as a disciple; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.354, influenced by the philosophical schools, depicts the Elijah-Elisha relation as that of philosopher-teacher and disciple – Elisha follows Elijah as his disciple). (iii) The disciples are with him (e.g., Flavius Philostratus Soph., *Vita Apol.*, 1.19, has Damis stay with the philosopher and commit to memory whatever he learned; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.354, says that Elisha was Elijah's disciple and attendant as long as Elijah was alive). (iv) The disciples receive benefit from being in the company of the philosopher. Several examples suffice. Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 4.1.1, says of Socrates:

Socrates was so useful in all circumstances and in all ways, that any observer gifted with ordinary perception can see that nothing was more useful than the companionship (συνεῖναι) of Socrates, and time spent with him (μετ' ἐκείνου) in any place and in any circumstances.

In *Memorabilia* 1.2.24-28, Xenophon says:

So long as they were with (συνήστην) Socrates, they found him an ally who gave them strength (ἐδυνάσθην) to conquer their evil passions.

Seneca, *Ep.* 6.5-6, says in the same vein:

Cleanthes could not have been the express image of Zeno, if he had merely heard his lectures; he also shared his life, saw into his hidden purposes, and watched him to see whether he lived according to his own rules. Plato, Aristotle, and the whole throng of sages who were destined to go each his different way, derived more benefit from the character than from the words of Socrates. It was not the classroom of Epicurus, but living together under the same roof, that made great men of Metrodorus, Hermarchus, and Polyaeus.

Seneca, *Ep.* 94.40-42, says association with good men is an aid to virtue:

We are indeed uplifted by meeting wise men; and one can be helped by a great man even when he is silent'.

In the Cynic Epistles, *Ep.* 12, says:

It is not the country that makes good men, nor the city bad ones, but rather time spent with good men and bad. Consequently, if you want your sons to become good men and not bad, send them ... to a philosopher's school.

It was the association with the teacher that gave the disciples their benefits and made them better people.

These statements about the benefits disciples received from 'being with' a philosopher do not refer to the disciples' imitation of their teacher but rather to their being enabled by their association with him. This is a philosophic variation on the general Mediterranean belief that one's being in the presence of a deity causes transformation of the self⁽⁵⁴⁾. Pythagoras, for example, declared that 'our souls experience a change when we enter a temple and behold the images of the gods face to face' (Seneca, *Ep.* 94.42). This conviction was widespread in antiquity (e.g., Corpus Hermeticum 10.6; 13.3; Philo, *Moses* 1.158-159; 2 Cor 3,18; 1 John 3,6; *Ep. Diognetus* 2.5). In all such cases it is a matter of human transformation by vision. In the case of the philosopher, the vision is not of a god but of a god-like man. The effects are the same: human transformation.

The benefits, it was believed, were not limited to being with the philosopher in person. Recollection had its impact. Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 4.1.1, speaks about the recollection of Socrates by his disciples when they were separated as an aid to virtue. 'The constant recollection of him in absence brought no small good to his constant companions and followers'. Books and the use of the imagination also played a part. Seneca, *Ep.* 52.7 and 11.8-10, advocates looking to the ancients for models with whom to associate. In *Ep.* 25.6, he says that if one cannot be in a philosopher's presence, one should come to know him through books, acting as if he were constantly at one's side. Epistles 25.5, 11.10, and 11.8, advocate using the imagination to picture one's teacher as ever before him and himself as ever in the teacher's presence. The presence of the disciples with their master through books and imagination was regarded, however, as second best. Seneca, *Ep.* 6.5, writes: 'The living voice and the intimacy of a common life will help you more than the written word'. The point of all this is that disciples' being with their teacher was an aid to personal transformation. Being with him conveyed benefits in their moral progress. Being with him enabled them to do good and to be better people. Plutarch captured part of why that is so. In *De prof. virt.*, 84d, he says that one's being in the presence of a good and perfect man has the effect: 'great is his craving all but to merge his own identity in that of the good man'.

Matthew used the idea of disciples being with their teacher to

⁽⁵⁴⁾ See J.A. FITZMYER, *Paul and His Theology. A Brief Sketch* (Englewood Cliffs ²1989) 69-70, and the bibliography listed there.

convey part of his indicative. During Jesus' earthly career his disciples were with him. They heard him teach and saw him act. They saw the correspondence between his life and teaching. They could ask him questions and hear his answers. This common life would have been assumed by ancient auditors to have provided enablement for the disciples' progress in their formation by Jesus. For example, in the Sermon on the Mount Jesus says to his disciples that they are salt and light (5,13-14) and are sound trees that bear good fruit (7,17-18). That is, Jesus assumes some transformation of the disciples' characters has taken place. From the Gospel's plot the only thing that has occurred so far that could explain their transformation is the fact that, having been called, they followed Jesus (4,20.22). That is, they were with him and this association had a transforming quality to it.

If being in a philosopher's presence was regarded as transforming by the ancients in a way that was more than disciples' imitation of their master, so likewise the disciples' being with Jesus in Matthew speaks of more than their imitation of him. Transformation by vision is heightened in the First Gospel by the fact that Jesus is depicted as divine. In Matthew, God is present in Jesus (1,23). The Evangelist, as a consequence, speaks of the worship of Jesus before his resurrection (e.g., 2,11; 8,2; 9,18; 14,33; 15,25; 20,20 — all unique to Matt) as well as after (28,9.17 — also unique to Matt)⁽⁵⁵⁾. Since in 4,10 Jesus says that worship belongs to God alone and since Jesus does not reject the worship, he must be viewed as Emmanuel, the one in whom and through whom God is present (1,23). By presenting Jesus as an appropriate object of worship, the Evangelist 'does, for all practical purposes, portray Jesus as divine' ⁽⁵⁶⁾. Hence the disciples' being 'with him' has not only the philosophic frame of reference but also the overtones of being changed by beholding deity. In Matthew, then, for the disciples to be 'with Jesus' is for them to be transformed by their vision of God-with-us.

After Jesus' departure, they could have been with him early on, in part, through their memory and recollection of him. Later it would have been through their reading of the First Gospel. They were with Jesus as they moved through the narrative plot with him. The being with him made possible by the story powered their transformation.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ M.A. POWELL, *God With Us. A Pastoral Theology of Matthew's Gospel* (Minneapolis 1995) 28-61, focuses on worship in the First Gospel.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ POWELL, *God With Us*, 58.

The power of the story to enable change is captured in an old Hasidic tale related by Gershom Scholem. It bears repeating.

When the Baal Shem had a difficult task before him, he would go to a certain place in the woods, light a fire and meditate in prayer — and what he set out to perform was done. When a generation later the “Maggid” of Meseritz was faced with the same task he would go to the same place in the woods and say: We can no longer light the fire, but we can still speak the prayers — and what he wanted done became reality. Again a generation later Rabbi Moshe Leib of Sassov had to perform this task. And he too went into the woods and said: We can no longer light the fire, nor do we know the secret meditations belonging to the prayer, but we do know the place in the woods to which it all belongs — and that would be sufficient; and sufficient it was. But when another generation had passed and Rabbi Israel of Rishin was called upon to perform the task, he sat down on his golden chair in his castle and said: We cannot light the fire, we cannot speak the prayers, we do not know the place, but we can tell the story of how it was done. And the story-teller adds, the story which he had told had the same effect as the actions of the other three ⁽⁵⁷⁾.

Being with him and experiencing the vision of God-with-us — in person, by means of recollection, or by means of the book (the First Gospel) — was a powerful assistance in their life of obedience ⁽⁵⁸⁾.

III. How Matthew's Indicative Controls His Imperative

The four techniques discussed above function in the Gospel of Matthew to provide an indicative of divine enablement that underlies the imperative in an ongoing way. The purpose of this section of the paper will be to show how this is so.

We may begin with Matt 28,19-20. On the basis of all power being given (by God) to him (cf. Matt 11,27; Dan 7,13-14), the Matthean Jesus issues a command to his followers. As you go, make disciples, baptizing them and teaching them (28,19-20a). A promise follows: ‘I am with you always, to the close of the age’ (vs 20b). Jesus’ promise is that he will empower them so they can fulfill the mission he has just commanded them to undertake. How else could the work of Jesus be accomplished if he did not enable it? (Indeed, 13,37 says that it is the Son of Man who

⁽⁵⁷⁾ G.G. SCHOLEM, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York 1946) 349-350. I am grateful to Prof. J. Sievers for pointing me to this text.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Another story (1850) that illustrates how being with an idealized figure over time transforms selfhood is N. HAWTHORN, “The Great Stone Face”, *Hawthorne's Short Stories* (ed. N. ARVIN) (New York 1975) 357-375.

sows the seed!) There is a widespread consensus that 28,18-20 is the key to understanding the whole Gospel⁽⁵⁹⁾. For this reason some have sought to use 28,20 as the indicative underlying the imperative throughout the First Gospel⁽⁶⁰⁾. This seems impossible, however. Matt 28,19-20 limits the presence of Jesus with the disciples to their mission⁽⁶¹⁾. Jesus is with those evangelizing. What about those being evangelized (baptized and then taught to observe all Jesus commanded)? Matt 28,19-20 is silent about this dimension. Matt 19,26, all things are possible with God, surely is the general answer to this question. The issue is: how does Matthew see this divine enablement worked out?

The four techniques that speak of divine activity in a behind-the-scenes way are relevant here. (1) Revelation enables both the confession of Jesus (16,17) and the bearing of abundant fruit (13,23 — which surely includes ethical living). (2) Baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit opens the door to divine assistance. For example, when two or three are gathered in Jesus' name, then he is present in their midst (18,20). This logion which seems to be a Christian variant of a non-Christian Jewish saying about the Shekhinah's presence in the midst of two or three who discuss Torah (m. Av 3,2b [3]; ARN [B] 34)⁽⁶²⁾ is set in the context of church discipline⁽⁶³⁾. It indicates that when Christians are involved in the task of settling church disputes among its members, the presence of Jesus is with them to empower their decisions⁽⁶⁴⁾. Or when disciples are brought before hostile authorities, 'what you are to say will be given you in that hour; for it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of your Father speaking through you' (10,19-20). Here a combination of revelation given to disciples is combined with the activity of the Spirit in whose name one has been baptized (remember 3,11). Or again, when disciples invoke the name of their heavenly Father (6,9-13; 7,7-11), this evokes His answering response (e.g., leading us not into

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Most recent literature references O. MICHEL, "Der Abschluss des Matthäus-Evangeliums", *EvTh* 10 (1950-1951) 21.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ M.E. BORING, "Matthew", 159, 504.

⁽⁶¹⁾ P.E. BONNARD, *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (CNT[N]; Neuchâtel 1970) 419, 457.

⁽⁶²⁾ J. SIEVERS, "Where Two or Three... The Rabbinic Concept of Shekhinah and Matthew 18:20", *Standing Before God* (FS. J.M. Oesterreicher [ed. A. FINKEL — L. FRIZZELL] New York 1981) 171-182.

⁽⁶³⁾ J.D.M. DERRETT, "'Where Two or Three Are Convened in My Name'... A Sad Misunderstanding", *ET* 91 (1979) 83-86.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ BONNARD, *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*, 275.

temptation; delivering us from the Evil One; giving us discernment about the difference between good and evil). (3) Jesus' being with his disciples, moreover, affects the way they behave ('Can the wedding guests mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them?' [9,15]) and comes to their aid when their faith is weak (17,17, 19-20). (4) When the disciples are with Jesus their character is shaped for the better. The Gospel assumes one's actions arise out of one's character:

The good man out of his good treasure brings forth good, and the evil man out of his evil treasure brings forth evil (12,35);

What comes out of the mouth proceeds from the heart, and this defiles a man. For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander (15,18-19).

The Sermon on the Mount assumes Jesus' disciples have been transformed ('You are the salt of the earth' [5,13]; 'You are the light of the world' [5,14]; 6,22; 7,17-18)⁽⁶⁵⁾. How is this possible (in the plot of the First Gospel)? All that has gone before is their call and their following Jesus, that is, being with him (4,18-22). Being with him, it is implied, has changed their character. As one moves along through the Gospel, it is not difficult to see how this took place. When Jesus teaches with a 'focal instance' (e.g., 5,38-42) it requires the reorientation of the hearer's values⁽⁶⁶⁾; when he teaches in certain parables that shatter one's old world (e.g., 20,1-15) and help form a new one, it necessitates a reorientation of life⁽⁶⁷⁾. When Jesus' proverbs jolt their hearers out of the project of making a continuity of their lives (e.g., Matt 5,44; 16,25; 19,24), it demands a reorientation⁽⁶⁸⁾. When Jesus behaves in certain provocative ways before them (e.g., 8,2-3; 9,10-13; 12,1-14) it forces a disciple to a reorientation of life. When the disciples encounter Jesus' healing as visual teaching (e.g., 15,29-30), they join the crowds in their glorifying the God of Israel (15,31)⁽⁶⁹⁾. Being with Jesus is a constant aid to

⁽⁶⁵⁾ MEYER, *Five Speeches That Changed the World*, 47.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ R. TANNEHILL, *The Sword of His Mouth* (Semeia Studies 1; SemSup 1; Philadelphia 1975) 67-77.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ W.A. BEARDSLEE, "Parable Interpretation and the World Disclosed by the Parable", *PRSt* 3 (1976) 123-139.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ W.A. BEARDSLEE, "Uses of the Proverb in the Synoptic Gospels", *Interpretation* 24 (1970) 61-73.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ S. BYRSKOG, *Jesus the Only Teacher*. Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community (CB.NT 24; Stockholm 1994) 274-275.

transcending one's old ways, to being transformed by the renewing of their minds (Rom 12,2). From these observations it seems clear that no area of life is left untouched by one or more of Matthew's four techniques for alluding to divine assistance in a disciple's experience.

Another angle of vision about the relevance of the four techniques is to look at how they relate to the five major teaching sections of the First Gospel (i.e., Matthew's imperative = all that I have commanded you). (1) The link with Matt 18 is explicit. Both the name of Jesus and Jesus' presence in the disciples' midst are employed. (2) A connection with Matt 13 is seen in the revelation by Jesus to the disciples of the eschatological plan of God. (3) Matt 10 is covered under 28,20's 'with you' in your mission and by the invocation of the name of the Spirit of the Father who speaks through the disciples. (4) The Sermon on the Mount utilizes the invocation of the name in prayer to the Father and speaks of discernment being given to those who ask. The disciples' being with Jesus explains how their character could be salt and light. (5) In the eschatological chapters of the fifth teaching section, 26,29 comes into play. Jesus will be with his disciples even beyond the resurrection/judgment when they share the messianic banquet together. There is no big teaching section that does not have a link to one or more of Matthew's techniques for speaking about the enabling presence of God in the disciples' lives.

Two reminders are helpful at this point. First, one should remember that these techniques are functionally virtually interchangeable in a biblical context. The presence of God 'with you' is virtually synonymous with 'assistance by God's name' ('My faithfulness and my steadfast love shall be with him, and in my name shall his horn be exalted' [Ps 89 (88),24]; remember Matt 18,20). The presence of God 'with you' is an alternative way of saying 'God's Spirit is in your midst':

Take courage, all you people of the land, says the Lord; work, for I am with you, says the Lord of hosts, according to the promise that I made with you when you came out of Egypt. My Spirit abides among you; fear not (Hag 2,4-5; cf. Luke 1,28.35).

The presence of God 'with you' is closely associated with revelation given to one (the Lord be with Solomon [1 Kgs 1,37]; God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding [4,29]; cf. John 14,16-17, 26). 'In the name of' and Spirit are closely linked ('in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit you were washed, sanctified, justified' [1 Cor 6,11]). Anyone familiar with this biblical way of

speaking would have been sensitive to Matthew's use of his conceptual repertoire. Second, one should remember that in the First Evangelist's scheme of things, when the narrative speaks of Jesus' presence, it is God who is with us in Emmanuel (1,23).

At every point in a disciple's life and at every stage of salvation history, therefore, Matthew speaks of the divine indicative, divine enablement for the whole of a disciple's existence from its beginning unto the messianic banquet! Granted all of this is unobtrusive, almost invisible to the eye that is focused on the surface of the plot of the Gospel. That is as it should be, however, given that in Matt 5-25, as far as disciples are concerned, the Evangelist is telling his story in terms of omnipotence-behind-the-scenes. This is not the way Paul or the Fourth Evangelist would tell the story but it is Matthew's way. Matthew's way, moreover, involves him in neither soteriological legalism nor legalistic covenantal nomism. Like Paul, his soteriology is by grace from start to finish. He just uses a different conceptual repertoire. Surely he cannot be faulted for that!

Baylor University
Waco, Texas (USA) 76798-7294

Charles H. TALBERT

SUMMARY

It is usually thought that Matthew emphasizes the imperative at the expense of the indicative, demand over gift. Identifying Matthew's indicative is difficult because in chapters 5-25, insofar as disciples are concerned, the narrative is told in terms of 'omnipotence behind the scenes'. In Matt 5-25 four techniques appropriate to such a method of narration speak of the divine indicative in relation to the imperative. They are (1) I am with you/in your midst, (2) invoking the divine name, (3) it has been revealed to you/you have been given to know, and (4) being with Jesus. They show Matthew's soteriology is by grace from start to finish.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Dionysus *theomachos*? Echoes of the *Bacchae* in 3 Maccabees

The Sophist Zenobius records the Athenian proverb ‘nothing to do with Dionysus’ (οὐδέν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον). This proverb probably accounted for the absence of Dionysiac elements in Greek drama⁽¹⁾. Yet, if the proverb can be said to refer to the absence of Dionysus in drama, it can also be taken to apply to the recent interpretation of 3 Maccabees: it, too, has ‘nothing to do with Dionysus’ and the Dionysiac elements present there have been largely overlooked in favour of other concerns.

Traditionally, these concerns have been historical: this work has been mined for information about the Jews in Egypt, with considerably less attention having been devoted to its literary features⁽²⁾. Even when literary issues have been taken into account, source-critical questions have tended to predominate⁽³⁾. My purpose, then, is to leave historical and source-critical questions to one side, and to argue that 3 Maccabees does have something to do with Dionysus. I shall examine the presence of suggestive literary and thematic echoes of Euripides in the work, particularly Pentheus’ hapless opposition to Dionysus⁽⁴⁾. In adducing these echoes, I shall argue that the

⁽¹⁾ Cited in A.W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy* (Oxford 1962) 294-295. The meaning of the proverb is discussed more fully in the introduction to *Nothing to do with Dionysus*. Athenian Drama in its Social Context (ed. J.J. WINKLER – F.I. ZEITLIN) (Princeton 1990) 3.

⁽²⁾ F. PARENTE, “The Third Book of Maccabees as Ideological Document and Historical Source”, *Henoch* 10 (1988) 148-182, provides a valuable précis of the history of interpretation. See, as well, the seminal essay by V. TCHERIKOVER, “The Third Book of Maccabees as a Historical Source of Augustus’ Time”, *ScrHie* 7 (1961) 1-26. For recent defences of the work’s historicity, see A. KASHER, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. The Struggle for Equal Rights* (TSAJ 7; Tübingen 1985) 211-232 and J.M. MODRZEJEWSKI, *The Jews of Egypt. From Ramses II to Emperor Hadrian* (Princeton 1995) 141-153. Yet, its historicity is very questionable; cf. E. GRUEN, *Heritage and Hellenism. The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley 1998) 227-230; J.J. COLLINS, *Between Athens and Jerusalem* (New York 2000) 123.

⁽³⁾ See, for example, J. TROMP, “The Formation of the Third Book of the Maccabees”, *Henoch* 17 (1995) 311-328. The sources of 3 Maccabees are puzzling. One of the most problematic issues is the work’s relationship to Josephus’ account of a similar incident in the reign of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II (*C. Ap.* 2.49-55). 3 Maccabees also manifests pronounced similarities with the Heliodorus episode in 2 Maccabees (3,1-40) and points of contact with Greek Esther, while the language used by the author is akin to that found in the *Letter of Aristaeas*. Two works that do concentrate on the literary features of the work are J.R. HARRIS, “Metrical Fragments in III Maccabees”, *BJRL* 5 (1919) 1-13, and M. HADAS, *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees* (New York 1953) 13-16.

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. R. SEAFORD, “Thunder, Lightning and Earthquake in the *Bacchae* and the Acts of the Apostles”, *What is a God? Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity* (ed. A.B. LLOYD)

author draws on the literary heritage of the Greeks in order to pillory Philopator's Dionysiac pretensions⁽⁵⁾.

1. Familiarity with the *Bacchae*

Can we assume that the author of 3 Maccabees would have had some familiarity with the story of Pentheus and with the *Bacchae*? There are three reasons for supposing so. First, the story of Pentheus was celebrated in the Greek world⁽⁶⁾. Not only was Euripides' *Bacchae* justly renowned⁽⁷⁾, its subject matter also appeared in a tetralogy by Aeschylus and in the works of other Athenian dramatists, including possibly Thespis himself⁽⁸⁾.

Second, both the myth of Pentheus and Euripides' *Bacchae* itself appear to have been very familiar in Alexandria. Theocritus, *Idyll*. 26, in probable dependence on the *Bacchae*, recounts the detection of Pentheus as he spies on the τελεταί of his mother and aunts. In addition, Callimachus describes a mask of Dionysus yawning with boredom at hearing schoolchildren endlessly parrot lines from the *Bacchae*: 'And here I am set, gaping twice as widely as the Samian [Dionysus], the tragic Dionysus, hearkening to children as they say "Sacred is the lock of hair", repeating "my own dream to me"'⁽⁹⁾. The final phrase — 'repeating my own dream to me' — as Gow and Page suggest, means 'stale news to me'⁽¹⁰⁾. The implication is that these lines would have been as familiar to his audience as our own national anthem is to us.

Third, it is entirely probable that a contemporary Jewish author should be familiar with these Greek traditions. The *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the tragedian, for example, is infused with echoes of the fifth-century dramatists⁽¹¹⁾. Moses Hadas remarks — not, perhaps, without hyperbole — that 'Every work in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament has expressions from or allusions to tragedy which the reader was obviously expected to

(London 1997) 139-151. Seaford posits a connection between the *Bacchae* and the Acts of the Apostles but views ritual as the element that links the two.

⁽⁵⁾ While most scholars regard the provenance of 3 Maccabees as Alexandrian, its dating is controverted. Although the case for an earlier date (*ca.* 85 BCE) is more convincing than one under Gaius (*ca.* 38-41 CE), GRUEN, *Heritage*, 225-226, convincingly argues that the evidence for a secure dating is too insubstantial. An earlier date is defended by J.M.G. BARCLAY, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*. From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE-117 CE) (Edinburgh 1996) 202-203, while COLLINS, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 124-128, opts for a later dating.

⁽⁶⁾ T. GANTZ, *Early Greek Myth* (Baltimore – London 1993) 481-483.

⁽⁷⁾ Its popularity is attested, for instance, by the gruesome performance of the play in Parthia, as described in Plutarch, *Crassus* 33.

⁽⁸⁾ E.R. DODDS, *Bacchae* (Oxford 1960) xxviii, lists a Βάκχαι by Xenocles, a Βάκχαι ἡ Πενθεύς by Iophon, son of Sophocles, a Βάκχαι by Cleophon, and a Διόνυσος by Chaeremon among other plays. The early Roman playwrights Pacuvius and Accius produced plays on a similar theme: see G.B. CONTE, *Latin Literature*. A History (Baltimore – London 1994) 104-107. For the continuing influence of the *Bacchae* in the Hellenistic period, cf. C. SCHNEIDER, *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus* (München 1969) II, 804.

⁽⁹⁾ Callimachus, Epigram 49 in CALLIMACHUS, *Hymns and Epigrams*, Lycophron, *Aratus*. With an English Translation by G.R. Mair (LCL; Cambridge, Mass. 1921) 171-173. The children recite line 494 of the *Bacchae*.

⁽¹⁰⁾ A.S.F. GOW – D.L. PAGE, *The Greek Anthology*. Hellenistic Epigrams (Cambridge 1975) II, 183.

⁽¹¹⁾ H. JACOBSON, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge 1983) 23-28.

recognize' ⁽¹²⁾. Since our author appears to be somewhat familiar with Greek tragedy and has pretensions to literary artistry, allusions to the subject matter of the *Bacchae* are certainly possible ⁽¹³⁾. I assume either that the author was familiar with the work or had attended some performance of the play ⁽¹⁴⁾.

This examination will begin by focussing on two themes present both in 3 Maccabees and the *Bacchae*: *hybris* and divine nemesis or retribution. It will argue for strong parallels between Pentheus and Ptolemy IV Philopator, and then consider the extent to which Philopator is represented as the embodiment of Dionysus himself.

2. Philopator as *Theomachos*

The defining situation of both 3 Maccabees and Euripides' *Bacchae* is a king who recklessly opposes a God. Both Pentheus and Philopator are portrayed as *theomachoi*, god-fighters who persistently engage in acts of *hybris* and impiety ⁽¹⁵⁾. In the two works this *hybris* and impiety are manifested in several ways ⁽¹⁶⁾. First of all, each of the rulers is fixated on seeing those things that are forbidden for him to see. Philopator, notwithstanding the Jews' fervent pleas, indulges his desire to enter into the Holy of Holies, an act forbidden to all but the High Priest, and permitted even to him only once a year ⁽¹⁷⁾. Scorning the law, the king in his arrogance holds that even if others 'are deprived of this honour, it is not fitting that I should be' (3 Macc 1,12). Pentheus, too, is told that, as an impious man (Euripides, *Ba.* 475), it is not lawful (θέμις) for him to learn of the rites of Dionysus (ibid., 471, 474), and Dionysus addresses Pentheus in similar terms: 'You...are so

⁽¹²⁾ M. HADAS, *Hellenistic Culture. Fusion and Diffusion* (New York [1959] 1972) 130. Hadas himself detects echoes of the *Bacchae* in 4 Maccabees; cf. HADAS, *Maccabees*, 97. For dramatic allusions in secular Greek novels, see J.A. PLETCHER, "Euripides in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika* 7-8", *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 9 (1998) 17-27.

⁽¹³⁾ H. ANDERSON, "3 Maccabees", *OTP* II, 524, n. g. isolates an iambic line from 'an unidentified Gk. Tragic poet' at 5,31. The verse reconstructions by HARRIS, "Metrical Fragments", 13, are ingenious, but not especially convincing. The literary pretensions of 3 Maccabees' author can be gauged from the number of arcane words he uses, prompting Anderson to dub him 'a pseudo-classicist or pseudo-Atticist' (ibid., 510).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Philo's own example suggests that educated Alexandrian Jews attended the theatre (Philo, *Ebr.* 177; *Prob.* 141); he evidently expected his readers would also be conversant with it (Philo, *Flacc.* 38; *Legat.* 368).

⁽¹⁵⁾ Pentheus is τὸν ἄθεον ἄνομον ἄδικον (Euripides, *Ba.* 995), while Philopator is described as ὁ δυσσεβής (3 Macc 3,1), and his behaviour as ἄνομον (3 Macc 1,27). See, further, Euripides, *Ba.* 374, 476, 490, 502; and 3 Macc 6,10.

⁽¹⁶⁾ An interesting point common to the two works is that the charges of impiety are reflexive. H.S. VERSNEL, *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion* (Leiden 1990) I, 172-177, remarks that the *Bacchae* displays 'asebeia versus asebeia', with Dionysus and Pentheus each accusing the other of impiety. So, too, with 3 Maccabees: Philopator's edict against the Jewish people describes them as τοὺς δυσσεβεῖς (3 Macc 3,24). The overall effect is ironic, contributing to the tragic irony of the *Bacchae* and the comic irony of 3 Maccabees.

⁽¹⁷⁾ The episodes differ in their placement within the overall narratives. In 3 Maccabees the episode serves largely as a preamble to the subsequent actions, while in the *Bacchae* it is the culmination. The narratives are similar, however, in representing the protagonist as having disregarded earlier theophanies. Pentheus ignores Tiresias' account of Dionysus' origins (Euripides, *Ba.* 272-297), and Philopator (seemingly) ignores his divine punishment in the temple.

eager to see what you should not see and seek things that must not be sought' (ibid., 912-913). Yet, Pentheus is unrepentantly obsessed with catching a glimpse of these rites, having earlier confessed: 'I would give a great weight of gold for that' (ibid., 812). Each king, therefore, wilfully disregards what is lawful and puts his own gratification above honouring divinely appointed laws.

The two kings' *hybris* is such that they are not simply negligent of the god's cult — they strive to eradicate it altogether. Philopator vows to destroy the Jerusalem temple with fire and 'for all time to empty it of those who sacrificed there' (3 Macc 5,43), while Pentheus actively resists the introduction of Bacchic rites into Thebes and promises to 'put an end quickly to this destructive Bacchism' (Euripides, *Ba.* 232)⁽¹⁸⁾. Their *hybris*, therefore, brings them to persecute the gods' true worshippers. In a remarkable series of parallels, each king condemns the devotees of the god he scorns. Each advocates a mass arrest, binds the god's devotees in chains, imprisons them within his city, and, ultimately, threatens them with death⁽¹⁹⁾.

The magnitude of their *hybris* is expressed in a striking common metaphor, where the godfighter's *hybris* is likened to that of the giants. In 3 Maccabees the high priest Simon praises god as 'a righteous ruler who condemns all who act with *hybris* and arrogance ... among whom were the giants relying on their strength and boldness' (3 Macc 2,3-4). In the *Bacchae* the chorus of maenads entreats Dionysus to 'put an end quickly to the *hybris* of this murderous man', who, 'like a murderous giant fights against the gods' (Euripides, *Ba.* 543-4,555)⁽²⁰⁾. In both works the giants function as archetypal examples of violent and disobedient figures, who range themselves against the divine. Like giants, both Pentheus and Philopator arrogate for themselves positions to which they are not entitled. And, like the giants, they are unrelenting in their *hybris*⁽²¹⁾. The repeated supplications of the maenads, on the one hand, and the Jewish people on the other, establish the need for the gods to intervene and exact divine retribution.

3. Divine Retribution

The gods will clearly not tolerate such *hybris*. YHWH is μίσυβρις 'hybris-hating' (3 Macc 6,9). Dionysus, too, assures Pentheus that he will exact punishment for these acts of *hybris* (ὕβρισμαίων). Nevertheless, the gods are slow to punish. Although the two deities do intervene, they do so in intermittent fashion, and fail to act decisively until the works' climactic

⁽¹⁸⁾ Compare 3 Macc 2,14: 'this rash and profane man endeavours to violate (καθυβρίσαι) the holy place which is dedicated on earth to the name of your glory'.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Chains and imprisonment: Euripides, *Ba.* 226-231; 443-444; cf. 511-514; // 3 Macc 3,25; 5,5-6; 6,27. Death threats: Euripides, *Ba.* 794-7; // 3 Macc 5,42.

⁽²⁰⁾ 3 Maccabees's giants may recall LXX Gen 6,5. Apart from Jdt 16,7, the giants of Genesis do not seem to be commonly associated with those of Greek mythology until the first century CE; cf. *Sib.Or.* 1 123; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.73. For further discussion of the giant imagery in the *Bacchae*, see C. SEGAL, *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides' Bacchae* (Princeton 1982) 130-131.

⁽²¹⁾ Euripides, *Ba.* 375, 516, 555; // 3 Macc 2,3.21; 3,25; 6,9.12. On the notion of the *theomachos*, cf. J.C. KAMERBEEK, "On the Conception of ΘΕΟΜΑΧΟΣ in Relation with Greek Tragedy," *Mnemosyne* 4 (1948) 271-283; VERSNEL, *Inconsistencies*, 170-179.

endings. There is a definite retardation at work to make the *peripeteia* all the more pronounced when it does happen⁽²²⁾.

The punishment begins in much the same manner in the two works: the gods disorder and unseat the wits of the arrogant kings. In 3 Maccabees, to use Plutarch's evocative word, a 'theolepsis' takes place (Plutarch, *Mor.* 56e). The *Bacchae* relates that wine induces sleep and forgetfulness of the day's evils (ὕπνον τε λήθην τῶν καθ' ἡμέραν κακῶν [Euripides, *Ba.* 282]). These very things are visited upon Philopator. In an obvious parody of the Dionysiac effects of wine, YHWH induces slumber (ὕπνον: 3 Macc 5,11), oblivion and forgetfulness in the dissolute king: 'But this was the working of the God who rules over all things, who had placed into his mind forgetfulness (λήθην) of his former schemes' (3 Macc 5,28)⁽²³⁾. Yet his wits are also added: 'by the providence of God all his reason had been scattered' (διεσκεδάσθαι πᾶν αὐτοῦ τὸ νόημα: 3 Macc 5,30)⁽²⁴⁾. The culmination of this process transpires when the king and the rest of the hippodrome spectators witness the angelophany: 'a great shuddering seized the body of the king, and oblivion covered his sullen insolence' (3 Macc 6,20), with the consequence that the 'king's rage was turned to pity and tears for those things he had previously devised' (3 Macc 6,22). Through YHWH's intervention, Philopator is brought to a state of pliancy, where he ultimately comes to recognize 'the children of the almighty and living God of Heaven' (3 Macc 6,28).

Dionysus' dismantling of the wits of Pentheus is even more elaborate. He afflicts Pentheus with delusions (Euripides, *Ba.* 616-631; cf. 918-922), and then, playing on his obsession to see the Dionysiac *orgia*, inexorably drives him mad. Dionysus makes these intentions explicit in his address to the maenads: 'Let us punish him; first unseat his wits, loosing upon him light-headed madness; for in his senses he will certainly refuse to wear a woman's clothing, but if he is driving off the road of reason, he will wear it' (ibid., 850-854). And Pentheus does precisely this. Once he has assumed his costume, he, too becomes compliant. He tells Dionysus that he is now reliant on him (ibid., 934), and Dionysus assures him that, although his earlier mindset had been unhealthy, he now has just the healthy state of mind that he needs (ibid., 947-948)⁽²⁵⁾.

In addition to this mental disordering, the gods perform other miracles as a prelude to the *peripeteia*. By the providence of YHWH, the pens and paper give out in the registration of the Jews so that it cannot be completed (3 Macc 4,20). In the *Bacchae*, Dionysus imparts miraculous strength to his maenads (Euripides, *Ba.* 704-769). He reveals his own power by escaping from prison (ibid., 615-620), initiating the collapse both of the king's palace (ibid., 585-606) as well as the king's mind.

⁽²²⁾ R. PERVO, *Profit with Delight*. The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles (Philadelphia 1987) 48, 155, n. 168.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. 3 Macc 5,11: ὕπνου μέρος ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν βασιλέα; 3 Macc 5,11-12.28.30. Cf. Euripides, *Ba.* 384-386: 'the cup that casts sleep over men'.

⁽²⁴⁾ Note, too, the attribution of ἀλογιστία to the king (3 Macc 5,42; cf. 6,12).

⁽²⁵⁾ This theolepsy naturally opens the monarchs to ridicule. Dionysus, once he has induced Pentheus to cross-dress, gloatingly remarks: 'I want him to incur scorn from the Thebans' (Euripides, *Ba.* 854; cf. 632). Philopator's courtiers tacitly mock his mental vacillations when they complain that his *voltes-face* are jeopardising the city (3 Macc 5,40-41).

These miracles culminate in a climactic reversal, where the *theomachos* is decisively bested by the god whom he opposes. The *Bacchae* aptly describes this process: 'Many are the things the gods accomplish against our expectation. What seems probable does not come to pass' (ibid., 1389-1390). Pentheus, who in his *hybris* threatened to destroy the maenads, is himself destroyed by them. Philopator, who confidently expected to destroy the Jewish people with his enraged elephants, sees them savage his own forces. The gods, whom the kings had formerly reviled, are now acknowledged, and their followers decisively vindicated⁽²⁶⁾.

It is only at this point that the two works diverge significantly⁽²⁷⁾. The outworking of the *hybris/nemesis* theme is profoundly tragic in the *Bacchae*, with the fragmentation and exile of the royal household following quickly on the destruction of Pentheus. In 3 Maccabees it is comic (except, of course, for the soldiers and apostates). The king is reconciled with the Jewish people and their god; he establishes feasts for them and finishes by valuing them more highly than he had done at the outset.

4. *Theomachy: Dionysus versus YHWH*

These similarities between 3 Maccabees and the *Bacchae* could lead to the conclusion that the Pentheus theme is simply exploited by the author of 3 Maccabees to produce a template of the *theomachos*. But the parallels may go deeper. The *hybris/nemesis* themes suggest a very different sort of *theomachy*, one that is literally a battle of the gods, with YHWH ranged against Dionysus. To develop this *theomachy*, the author of 3 Maccabees identifies Ptolemy IV Philopator with Dionysus. Such an identification would hardly have been unprecedented⁽²⁸⁾ Ptolemy I on his accession, established a ruler cult, which counted both Heracles and Dionysus amongst its progenitors⁽²⁹⁾. Philopator was dubbed 'the new Dionysus' by his contemporary, the poet Euphronius⁽³⁰⁾. His Dionysian pretensions and dissolute features appear to have become proverbial largely because of an influential and scandalous work, the

⁽²⁶⁾ Strangely, neither work has its protagonist explicitly repent of his *hybris*. Philopator simply blames his courtiers. Pentheus speaks of errors (ἀμαρτίας [Euripides, *Ba.* 1121]) but it is not entirely certain whether these errors include his *hybris*.

⁽²⁷⁾ A further similarity can be adduced: each work has ritual associations. The work of R. SEAFORD, *Ritual and Reciprocity*. Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State (Oxford 1994) 284, particularly argues that the *Bacchae* is concerned with Dionysiac initiation. TROMP, "Formation", 327, has argued that the work is designed to give a concrete account of the establishment of the festival, one that would provide normative guidelines for its celebration.

⁽²⁸⁾ Both Alexander the Great and Demetrios Poliorchetes identified themselves closely with Dionysus. Cf. the remarks by A. HENRICHs, "Demythologizing the Past, Mythicizing the Present: Myth, History, and the Supernatural at the Dawn of the Hellenistic Period", *From Myth to Reason*. Studies in the Development of Greek Thought (ed. R. BUXTON) (Oxford 1999) 240-248.

⁽²⁹⁾ Cf. *OGIS* 54: "King Ptolemy (III) the Great, son of King Ptolemy (II) and Queen Arsinoe, the Brother-Sister Gods, children of King Ptolemy (I) and Queen Berenice the Saviour Gods, descended on his father's side from Heracles son of Zeus and on his mother's side from Dionysus son of Zeus..." in M.M. AUSTIN, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest* (Cambridge 1981) 365.

⁽³⁰⁾ τοῦ νέου Διονύσου. The fragment is cited in P.M. FRASER, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972) II, 347, n. 117.

enticingly-titled *Stories about Philopater* by Ptolemaios of Megalopolis⁽³¹⁾. Four centuries later, Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.* 47, is still able to state flatly, when speaking disparagingly of those who had proclaimed themselves gods: 'Ptolemy the fourth was called Dionysus'.

The author of 3 Maccabees promotes this identification in a variety of ways. One is obviously Philopater's repeated associations with wine, revelry, symposia and Dionysiac festivals⁽³²⁾. Of a piece with these features is his edict promoting the conversion of the Jews to the Dionysian mysteries: 'Those who were enrolled should be branded by fire on their body with an ivy leaf, the symbol of Dionysus' (3 Macc 2,29)⁽³³⁾.

A second tack is to attribute to Philopater the very mental attributes of Dionysus. The king vacillates from extremes of rabid ferocity to tractable benevolence. Like Dionysus, he is a figure 'most terrible and most sweet to mortals' (Euripides, *Ba.* 861) or, in this context, most terrible and most sweet to the Jews⁽³⁴⁾.

The king's terrible aspect is further developed through his association with wild animals (θηρία), specifically elephants⁽³⁵⁾, where his savage temper is consistently mirrored in the demeanor of his elephants⁽³⁶⁾. The elephants are pitiless (ἀνήμεϊς [3 Macc 5,10]) just as he is (3 Macc 5,47)⁽³⁷⁾. The elephants are made to drink drugged wine so that they become savage (3 Macc 5,2.10.43)⁽³⁸⁾, just as he drinks wine and becomes savage (3 Macc 5,16-20; 5,36-44).

The elephants suggest a further correlation with Dionysus. Under the Ptolemies, elephants came increasingly to be identified with Dionysus⁽³⁹⁾.

⁽³¹⁾ F. JACOBY, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* (Berlin 1929) II, B2 §161. Cf. Polybius 14.12.3; Plutarch, *Mor.* 56e.

⁽³²⁾ Drugged wine for elephants: 3 Macc 5,2.10.45; symposia: 4,16; 5,15.16.17.36; 6,33; cups: 5,16. It is likely that the phrase καὶ τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ στεφανωθήσεται (3 Macc 3,28) should be translated 'crowned at the Eleutheria'. Cf. the comments of ANDERSON, "3 Maccabees", 522, n. e.

⁽³³⁾ For an example of an edict by the historical Philopater treating Dionysiac mysteries, see *Select Papyri* (LCL; Cambridge, Mass. 1934) II, 57.

⁽³⁴⁾ For his savagery, see: 3 Macc 5,20.42 (Parallels to Phalaris); 5,30 (wrath). For Philopater's benevolence see: 3,18; 3,20 ('philanthropy to all men'); 3,15; 7,6 (ἐπιείκεια); 6,24 (εὐεργέτης).

⁽³⁵⁾ The prayer of Eliezer alludes to the deliverance of Daniel and Jonah from wild animals (3 Macc 6,6-8).

⁽³⁶⁾ The military uses of elephants are virtually ignored by 3 Maccabees. Remarkably, nothing is said about them in the account of the Battle of Raphia (3 Macc 1,1; contrast Polybius 5.84-86), and they are presented as though they were arena animals. Philopater's threat to give the family of Hermon, the elephant keeper, 'as a rich meal to the savage beasts instead of the Jews' (3 Macc 5,31) certainly produces this impression.

⁽³⁷⁾ Compare the remarks of W. OTTO, *Dionysus. Myth and Cult* (Bloomington - London 1965) 113: 'No single Greek god even approaches Dionysus in the horror of his epithets, which bear witness to a savagery that is absolutely without mercy'.

⁽³⁸⁾ Josephus' narrative (*C. Ap.* 2.49-55: 'bestias ipsas inebriasset') does not specify what had intoxicated the elephants, nor does it mention wine in the festival afterwards. Cf. Aelian, *Nat. an.* 13.8; Pliny, *Nat.* 8.24.8, relates that elephants are tamed by beer. In 1 Macc 6,34, by contrast, the elephants are given nothing to drink; they are only *shown* 'the juice of grapes and mulberries, to arouse them for battle'.

⁽³⁹⁾ H.H. SCULLARD, *The Elephant in the Greek and Roman World* (Cambridge 1974) 124-125, 254-255; J.M.C. TOYNBEE, *Animals in Roman Life and Art* (London 1973) 39; cf. plates 8, 9. For the historical Philopater's association with elephants, see *OGIS* 86.

This was the consequence of Dionysus' return from India, but also because Dionysus was regularly associated with a retinue of savage animals⁽⁴⁰⁾. 3 Maccabees appears to provide Philopator with an analogous train of elephants. Ignoring the presence of Hermon, the elephant keeper, the author twice associates the king directly 'with his wild beasts' (ὁ βασιλεὺς σὺν τοῖς θηρίοις [3 Macc 6,16; cf. 5,47]). The conjunction at 5,47 is especially evocative: 'The king's impious heart was filled with fierce anger, and with great vehemence he set forth along with the beasts wishing with pitiless heart to see with his own eyes the lamentable and wretched catastrophe of those we have described.' Philopator thus appears most terrible to the Jewish people.

Yet the author of 3 Maccabees is just as adept at parodying the Dionysiac 'sweet' side of Philopator. Once he has been 'tamed' and brought to acknowledge the Jewish people, the very first thing he does for them is instantly to provide them with wine: 'the king, summoning the overseer of the public revenues, ordered him to provide the Jews with wine and all the necessities for a feast for seven days' (3 Macc 6,30)⁽⁴¹⁾. Shortly afterward, he generously (εὐψύχως) provides them with another seven-day πότον at Ptolemais (3 Macc 7,18-19.)⁽⁴²⁾. While this festal motif is well established in Esther and elsewhere, wine is never mentioned in these accounts, much less mentioned first. It hardly needs to be added that the gift of wine is one of the most characteristic features of the god Dionysus. In the *Bacchae* itself we are told that he 'has given the vine that ends pain to men' (Euripides, *Ba.* 772; cf. 278-281), and that he sends forth a stream of wine to his maenads. Hence, it is fitting that the king, once he recognizes that the Jewish people are indeed loyal members of his following, sends forth a stream of wine to them.

If, then, Philopator is represented as a new Dionysus, it is evident that in the divine *theomachy* YHWH easily bests him. YHWH quells his savage bestiality, ironically, with a quasi-Dionysiac oblivion and slumber⁽⁴³⁾. The drunk and mania-filled (σχεδόν ... εἰς κατάστημα μανιῶδες) elephants do not heed their Dionysiac master, as his wild beasts usually do⁽⁴⁴⁾. Instead, they turn and savage Philopator's own troops. Finally, YHWH instills in Ptolemy IV a Dionysiac benevolence, where he provides his loyal subjects with wine and the materials for a feast. In a classic *peripeteia*, YHWH defeats Dionysus with Dionysus' own devices. YHWH proves more adept at imitating Dionysus than the new Dionysus does. At the same time, he moves the king

⁽⁴⁰⁾ TOYNBEE, *Animals*, 39. For the association of Dionysus with savage animals, cf. *h.Bacch.* 43-50; C. KERÉNYI, *Dionysos. Archetypal Image of Indestructible Life* (Princeton 1976) 80-89; ΟΤΤΟ, *Dionysus*, 108-114.

⁽⁴¹⁾ 3 Macc 6,30: ἐκέλευσεν οἶνους τε καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πρὸς εὐωχίαν ἐπιτήδεια τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις χορηγεῖν. Cf. 7,18: ἐκεῖ ἐποίησαν πότον σωτήριον τοῦ βασιλέως χορηγήσαντος αὐτοῖς εὐψύχως.

⁽⁴²⁾ Cf. the κωθών at 3 Macc 6,31.

⁽⁴³⁾ Given that some (later) pagan sources associate Dionysus with YHWH (Plutarch, *Mor.* 671c; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5), the author's imputation of Dionysiac traits to YHWH may be deliberately ironic.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ 3 Mac 5,45; compare Lucian, *Dionysus* 1-4, which may offer a traditional account of Dionysus defeating an army with elephants. Instead of trampling him and his θίασος, the elephants flee.

beyond the sphere of Dionysus. By replacing the Bacchic ἀλογία with a benevolent σωφροσύνη, the God of Israel subdues and tames the devotee of Dionysus, transforming him into a tractable and more rational figure.

Once he is gifted with reason, Philopator moves from his former derision of the 'power of the supreme god' (τὸ τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ κράτος [3 Macc 3,11]) to a fervent acknowledgment of him. The very last words attributed to him reveal that he has no further thoughts of *theomachy*:

Be sure of this, that if we devise any evil scheme against them [the Jews] or cause them any trouble, we shall have not man but the most high God, who is ruler of all power, as our adversary to exact vengeance for what is done, inexorably in all circumstances, and for all time ⁽⁴⁵⁾.

The victory goes to YHWH.

*
* *

The echoes that have been outlined above give expression to a different *theomachy*, one that is profoundly ironic⁽⁴⁶⁾. Ptolemy is able to serve Dionysus only at YHWH's pleasure. The Jewish people in Egypt may well be subject to the whims of Ptolemy, but Ptolemy can rule only by the authority of the God of Israel. The author of 3 Maccabees, therefore, draws on the literary heritage of the Greeks to skewer the Ptolemaic ruler-cult and particularly Philopator's Dionysiac pretensions. Ptolemy, though he purports to be a Dionysus, is really only a Pentheus after all. But then, YHWH is not a Dionysus⁽⁴⁷⁾. Foregoing the latter's customary σπαραγμός, YHWH contents himself with whipping the impudent king, and making him appear ridiculous. In the end, however, he bequeaths to the king a hitherto absent sobriety and σωφροσύνη and, what is more, a host of loyal Jewish subjects.

The work's comic ending also promotes this evaluation. It is true that the tragic ending of the *Bacchae* accentuates the *dynamis* of Dionysus: his power is not to be doubted. Yet the play also closes with Cadmus' reproach that Dionysus should not resemble humans in the severity of the punishment he metes out (Euripides, *Ba.* 1346, 1348); Dionysus should be more godlike. In this respect, the comic ending of 3 Maccabees reveals a figure more like a god. YHWH's miracles are understated, and performed almost with reluctance. His seeming unwillingness to manifest his power, ironically, is suggestive of a far more profound *dynamis*.

This contrast may help to explain part of the purpose of 3 Maccabees. R.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ 3 Macc 7,9; Anderson's translation.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ GRUEN, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 186-188, has recently drawn attention to the ironic and satiric tendencies of Jewish Hellenistic literature in general, as well as to those traits in this work especially (ibid., 234-236).

⁽⁴⁷⁾ This is not to deny that YHWH has considerable points of contact with Dionysus. Cf. n. 43 above, and see especially M. SMITH, "On the Wine God in Palestine (Gen 18, John 2, and Achilles Tatius)", *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh. Studies in Historical Method, Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism* (ed. S. COHEN) (RGRW 130/1; Leiden 1996) I, 227-237; M. HENGEL, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh 1995) 326-331.

Merkelbach suggests that there is an aretalogical component to Greek novels, and while the miraculous features in 3 Maccabees differ in some respects, they are open to the same interpretation⁽⁴⁸⁾. YHWH's climactic miracle is witnessed by an entire hippodrome full of hostile spectators. The miracle is sufficiently marvellous that the Jewish people later secure glory and awe from their enemies (3 Macc 7,21). The Jews themselves immediately move from lamentation to praise of God 'the deliverer and wonderworker' (τερματοποιόν). The miracles accomplished by YHWH show him to be the antithesis of idols 'impotent to answer or help' (3 Macc 5,16). When the Jewish people beg him to respond with a glorious manifestation (μεγαλομεροῦς ἐπιφανείας [3 Macc 5,8]), he answers in precisely that way.

We may even suggest that 3 Maccabees is designed as a response to the claims and pretensions of the ruler cult by offering an 'anti-aretalogy', demonstrating that Dionysus and Philopator, called Dionysus, are anything but divine. Whether Philopator is a Pentheus or even a Dionysus, he is still just a poor player strutting in the grand drama authored by YHWH. As a grateful audience, the Jewish people are inexorably brought to the conclusion that, with YHWH ruling, they need have 'nothing to do with Dionysus'.

Classical, Near Eastern and Religious Studies
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z1 (Canada)

J.R.C. COUSLAND

SUMMARY

3 Maccabees demonstrates some suggestive affinities with Euripides' *Bacchae*. The protagonists of both works are kings who become *theomachoi*. Pentheus and Ptolemy IV Philopator rashly attempt to spy on things that they ought not, and each suffers for his repeated *hybris*. Each king also attempts to kill the devotees of the god against whom he struggles, and each is punished with a disordering of his mental state.

3 Maccabees further develops the theme of *theomachy* by stressing the associations between Dionysus and Ptolemy IV Philopator — the 'New Dionysus'. YHWH effortlessly triumphs over the 'New Dionysus' with Dionysus' own devices — sleep and oblivion. Ironically, Philopator is only able to serve Dionysus at YHWH's pleasure. The Jewish people in Egypt may well be under the authority of Philopator, but Philopator only rules by the authority of the God of Israel. The author, therefore, draws on the literary heritage of the Greeks to pillory Philopator's Dionysiac pretensions.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ R. MERKELBACH, "Novel and Aretalogy", *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore - London 1994) (ed. J. TATUM) 283-295.

The Soteriology of the Second Letter of Peter

Discussion of the theology of the Second Letter of Peter has focused mainly on its ethics and eschatology⁽¹⁾. The following essay proposes that the ethics and eschatology of 2 Peter are best understood in the context of its presentation of Jesus Christ as savior.

The author of 2 Peter explicitly calls Jesus savior four times⁽²⁾ and probably refers to Jesus when he speaks of the savior a fifth time in 3,2. This is the principal role played by Jesus in the letter. It is implicit in the designation of Jesus as Christ, i.e. Messiah⁽³⁾, though there is no indication that the author of 2 Peter is aware of this; he seems to use Christ simply as a name for Jesus.

1. *How Jesus Saves*

The designation of Jesus as Lord is also related to the presentation of Jesus as savior. This is suggested by the linking of the titles 'Lord' and 'savior' in several passages⁽⁴⁾. It is most explicit in 2,1 where the false teachers opposed by 2 Peter are described as τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. The author of 2 Peter is adapting Jude 4 at this point, specifically the phrase τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι. In Jude it is clear that 'Master' is synonymous with 'Lord', and both probably refer to Jesus⁽⁵⁾. The same is probably true for 2 Peter, but the author of 2 Peter has replaced 'Lord' and the explicit reference to Jesus with the description of the Master as the one who purchased them. This implies an understanding of how Jesus saves, i.e. by purchasing his followers from those to whom they are enslaved.

This might refer to setting free enslaved persons by purchase, something known both from the Old Testament (cf. Lev 25,47-55) and

(1) E. KÄSEMANN, "An Apologia for Primitive Christian Eschatology" in his *Essays on New Testament Themes* (SBT 41; Naperville 1964 [orig. publ.: 1952]) 169-195; T. FORNBERG, *An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society. A Study of 2 Peter* (CB.NT; Lund 1977); R.J. BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (Word Biblical Themes; Dallas 1990) 41-107; J.D. CHARLES, *Virtue Amidst Vice. The Catalog of Virtues in 2 Peter 1* (JSNTSS 150; Sheffield 1997).

(2) 2 Pet 1,1.11; 2,20; 3,18.

(3) 2 Pet 1,1.8.11.14.16; 2,20; 3,18.

(4) 2 Pet 1,11; 2,20; 3,2.18.

(5) So C. BIGG, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (ICC; New York 1901) 327; R. J. BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC 50; Waco 1983) 39-40. J.N.D. KELLY, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (HNTC; New York 1969) 252, disagrees. A grammatically similar phrase (i.e. article – pronoun – noun – καὶ – noun – pronoun – noun – noun) is found in Titus 2,13. This phrase probably refers to Jesus as both God and savior (R.E. BROWN, *An Introduction to New Testament Christology* [New York 1994] 181-182). This is the most common interpretation of the passage (M.J. HARRIS, *Jesus as God. The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* [Grand Rapids 1992] 185).

Greek literature⁽⁶⁾. A particular form of this that might underlie 2 Peter is the sacral manumission practiced at Delphi; here Apollo purchased slaves for freedom⁽⁷⁾. However, two things make it more likely that 2 Pet 2,1 refers to transferring ownership of slaves from one master to another. One is the use of the term 'Master' for Jesus; it suggests that Jesus is the new owner of his followers. The other is the verb ἀγοράζω, which connotes purchase in the market⁽⁸⁾. Jesus has purchased his followers from their previous owner, and they have become Jesus' slaves. Thus the author of 2 Peter refers to himself as slave and apostle of Jesus Christ in 1,1⁽⁹⁾. Like Paul, the author presumes that it is better to be Jesus' slave than that of any other master⁽¹⁰⁾.

2 Peter says nothing about how Jesus made this purchase. The language of purchase is also used in Rev 14,4 without explanation of how the purchase was made, and in 1 Cor 6,20; 7,23, where it is only said that a price was paid. Rev 5,9 says that the purchase price was the blood of Jesus. This may be presumed wherever the language of purchase is used. If so, the author of 2 Peter regards Jesus' death as the price he paid to transfer his followers from their previous owner to his ownership.

2. From What Jesus Saves

2 Pet 2,1 does not specify the previous owner from whom Jesus purchased his followers. However, 2,19-20 strongly suggests that before being purchased by Jesus, his followers were slaves of corruption and the defilements of the world⁽¹¹⁾. In this passage the author describes the false teachers he opposes as promising freedom while they themselves are slaves of corruption (φθορᾶς). He then explains that someone is enslaved by whatever overcomes that person (v. 19), clearly presuming that the false teachers have been overcome by corruption. The author says this more directly in 2,12. The false teachers are like irrational animals, born for capture and corruption. In the corruption of the animals, the false teachers will also undergo corruption (φθαρήσονται)⁽¹²⁾. In 2,20 the author says, referring to the false teachers and any who might follow them, that if those who have escaped the defilements (μιάσματα) of the

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. Diodorus Siculus, *Hist.* 15.7.1; 36.2.2. This is clearly the idea in 1 Pet 1,18-19 where λυτρόω is used as in the LXX of Lev 25,47-55.

⁽⁷⁾ On manumission of slaves see S.S. BARTCHY, *Mallon Chresai*. First Century Slavery and 1 Corinthians 7:21 (SBLDS 11; Missoula 1973) 87-125.

⁽⁸⁾ Paul uses this term in a similar way in 1 Cor 6,19-20. On the other hand, when Paul speaks of manumission in Gal 3,13; 4,5, he uses ἐξαγοράζω. On this see I.H. MARSHALL, "The Development of the Concept of Redemption in the New Testament", *Reconciliation and Hope*. New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology (ed. R. BANKS) (Grand Rapids 1974) 156-157, especially n. 8. Diodorus Siculus also uses ἐξαγοράζω in *Hist.* 15.7.1; 36.2.2.

⁽⁹⁾ Cf. Rom 1,1; Gal 1,10; Phil 1,1; James 1,1; Jude 1.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. Rom 6,16-23; 1 Cor 7,22-23.

⁽¹¹⁾ Philo uses σωτηρία as the opposite of φθορά in *De vita Mosis* 1.146; *De praemiis* 22; *De aet. mundi* 37 and *Quest. in Gen.* 2.22.

⁽¹²⁾ The antecedent of αὐτῶν in 2,12 is unclear. I take it to refer to the irrational animals. According to BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 264, this is the view of most modern commentators.

world by recognizing Jesus are again overcome by them, their last state is worse than the first.

What does it mean to be a slave of corruption? The basic meaning of φθορά is destruction, with a strong implication that the destruction is caused by the kind of disintegration that occurs in decay, or even when something is eaten (see Philo, *De aet. mundi* 5). Thus φθορά is often seen as the negative counterpart of γένεσις⁽¹³⁾, and it is often paired with sickness (νόσος)⁽¹⁴⁾ and pestilence (λοιμός)⁽¹⁵⁾. It is also used to mean the sexual corruption of an unmarried woman⁽¹⁶⁾. When the connotation of disintegration is less prominent, φθορά is synonymous with ἀπώλεια⁽¹⁷⁾.

In addition to its use to mean physical destruction/disintegration, φθορά can also be used to mean metaphorical destruction/disintegration (like the English word 'corruption'). Thus Philo uses φθορά to mean the corruption of virtue (*Leg. alleg.* 1.105), even though virtues are intrinsically ἀφθάρτων (*De somniis* 2.258). Likewise he uses it to mean corruption of the soul⁽¹⁸⁾ and other immaterial entities, especially passion⁽¹⁹⁾.

2 Pet 2,12 clearly shows that the author of 2 Peter uses φθορά to mean physical corruption. Two things suggest that the author uses the term to mean metaphorical as well as physical corruption in 2,19. First, in 2,20 he implies that enslavement to φθορά is equivalent to being overcome by the defilements of the world. The basic meaning of μιάσμα is 'stain', e.g. a color imparted to a fabric. However, it is used almost exclusively in a figurative and pejorative sense to mean wrongful behavior of various kinds. It is used particularly to mean bodily wrongdoing⁽²⁰⁾, especially various kinds of killing⁽²¹⁾, sexual misconduct⁽²²⁾ and idolatry⁽²³⁾. Other defilements include drunkenness, gluttony, etc.⁽²⁴⁾. μιάσμα can designate not only bodily wrongdoing, but also defects of mind (cf. Philo, *De cher.* 16)

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. Philo, *De opif.* 58; *Leg. alleg.* 1.7; *De cher.* 51, 62; *Quis rerum div. heres* 209, 247; *De somniis* 1.253; *De dec.* 58; *De spec. leg.* 1.27; 2.154; 3.178; *De virt.* 132; *De praemiis* 68; *De aet. mundi* 8, 27, 117, 137; *Quest. in Gen.* 4.8b.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. Philo, *Quod Deus* 124; *De plant.* 114; *De ebr.* 12, 141; *De spec. leg.* 3.28; *De aet. mundi* 37, 67, 126; Josephus, *Ant.* 6.3.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 7.324; 8.115; 10.116; *De bello iud.* 6.421.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cf. Philo, *Quod det.* 102; *De conf. ling.* 117; *De vita Mosis* 1.300; *De spec. leg.* 2.13; 3.65, 72; 4.84; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.339; 4.251; 5.339; 17.309; *Contra Ap.* 2.276.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. Philo, *De congr.* 119; *De vita Mosis* 1.145; *De aet. mundi* 20.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Philo, *Leg. alleg.* 2.77; *De plant.* 114; *De ebr.* 23; *Quest. in Gen.* 2.22.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Philo, *Leg. alleg.* 2.102; *De agr.* 109; *De somniis* 2.270.

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. Philo's association of lawlessness with the soul, defilement with the body, and blasphemy with the tongue in *De dec.* 93.

⁽²¹⁾ Philo mentions the following as defilements: child sacrifice (*De Abr.* 181), fratricide (*De Jos.* 13; *De praemiis* 68), capital punishment (*De vita Mosis* 2.214), murder (*De spec. leg.* 3.89, 92), manslaughter (*De spec. leg.* 3.121) and sacrifice of a pregnant animal (*De virt.* 138). Josephus treats killing as defilement in *Ant.* 2.33; *De bello iud.* 2. 455, 473; 6.110.

⁽²²⁾ Philo mentions adultery (*De Jos.* 45), the Israelites' consorting with the Moabite women in Numbers 25 (*De vita Mosis* 1.303-304), prostitution (*De spec. leg.* 1.102; 3.51), pederasty (*De spec. leg.* 3.42) and bestiality (*De spec. leg.* 3.49).

⁽²³⁾ Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 9.262, 263, 272; 12.286.

⁽²⁴⁾ Cf. Philo, *De spec. leg.* 1.206, 281. Josephus also mentions secretions and contact with the dead as defilement (*Ant.* 3.262), as well as theft of something consecrated to God (*Ant.* 5.42).

or soul⁽²⁵⁾. These defects may especially consist of inner states that lead to bodily wrongdoing. Thus Philo refers to defilement of the minds of those who premeditate murder (*De spec. leg.* 3.92) and speaks of love of money, reputation and pleasure as defilement (*De spec. leg.* 1.281).

Second, in 2 Pet 2,18 the author implies that enslavement to φθορά is equivalent to living in error (πλάνη) and involvement in licentious desires of the flesh⁽²⁶⁾. Philo also connects error and corruption in various ways. Thus he says that those who listen neither to right reason nor to education will receive corruption (*De ebr.* 35)⁽²⁷⁾. Destruction of the reasoning principle causes corruption (*Quod Deus* 16); one who will not listen will receive corruption (*Quod Deus* 183). Those who lack knowledge receive corruption⁽²⁸⁾. In *Quod Deus* 15 Philo links desire and corruption.

The author of 2 Peter may understand enslavement to corruption to mean 'subject to corruption', i.e., mortal. This seems to be the meaning of slavery to corruption in Rom 8,21. In line with this, the author of 2 Peter mentions frequently that destruction (ἀπώλεια) is the end of those enslaved to corruption. The false teachers introduce heresies of destruction and by denying the Master who bought them, bring destruction on themselves (2,1). Their destruction does not sleep (2,3). Just as the former world was destroyed (3,6), so the present heavens and earth are treasured up for the destruction of the impious (3,7). Because God does not wish that any be destroyed, God gives time for repentance (3,9). The ignorant and unstable twist the letters of Paul to their own destruction (3,16)⁽²⁹⁾.

However, the author of 2 Peter also understands enslavement to corruption as meaning being overcome by the defilements of the world, living in error and being subject to licentious desires. In 2,10 the author describes those whom the Lord will punish as going after the flesh in the desire for defilement (μιασμοῦ). Cf. also 3,3. Enslavement to this metaphorical corruption leads to literal corruption.

3. Origin of Predicament

The followers of Jesus were previously enslaved to corruption and the defilements of the world, and have escaped this enslavement through recognition of Jesus as savior. 2 Peter does not explain how this enslavement to corruption and the defilements of the world came to be; however, several passages hint at an explanation that seems to be presupposed. 2,18 says that the false teachers tempt those who have escaped those who live in error, by speaking bombast of futility (ματαιότητος) and appealing to licentious desires of the flesh. Having escaped those who live

⁽²⁵⁾ Cf. Philo, *Quod det.* 133, 170; *Quod Deus* 126; Josephus, *De bello iud.* 6.48.

⁽²⁶⁾ Corruption and desire are also connected in 1,4. Desire is also presented negatively in 2,10; 3,3.

⁽²⁷⁾ Philo also says that lack of education causes corruption in *De ebr.* 141. In *De plant.* 114 he says that improper education leads to corruption.

⁽²⁸⁾ Philo, *Quis rerum div. heres* 204; cf. *Leg. alleg.* 3.52; *De post. Caini* 164.

⁽²⁹⁾ Cf. Paul's designation of unbelievers as 'those who are being destroyed' in 1 Cor 1,18; 2 Cor 2,15; 4,3; 2 Thess 2,10. In Phil 1,28; 3,19; 2 Thess 2,3; 1 Tim 6,9 a similar idea is expressed in a different way.

in error is probably another description of freedom from slavery to corruption. Since the false teachers tempt them with futile speech and an appeal to desire, it seems likely that this is how they originally became slaves to corruption. Since futility is the opposite of knowledge (see Philo, *De conf. ling.* 141 and esp. 159), it is easy to see how futile speech would lead people into error and thus into slavery to corruption. The causal role of desire is confirmed by 1,4 which refers to the author and readers of 2 Peter as ones who have escaped the corruption in the world by desire. Thus the author of 2 Peter sees enslavement to corruption, not as intrinsic to the human condition, but as due to error, futility and the desires of the flesh⁽³⁰⁾. We can probably see yet another reference to Jesus' followers' having escaped slavery in 1,9 which mentions the cleansing of past sins. This suggests that enslavement to corruption derives from sin.

We find a similar constellation of ideas in the letter of Paul to the Romans. In Rom 8,20 Paul says that all creation was subjected to futility by God; in the following verse this futility is equated with slavery to corruption. In saying this Paul refers back to 1,18-32, where he explains how this happened. Although God revealed himself to humans (v. 19), they did not glorify God or give thanks to him, but became futile in their thinking (v. 21) and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image resembling a corruptible human being (v. 23). Therefore God gave them up to the desires of their hearts (v. 24). The desires of their hearts led human beings into the futility of offering the worship proper to God to images of corruptible human beings. When God gave them over to these desires of their hearts, the desires of their hearts made them slaves to corruption. In 5,12 Paul speaks of the same thing as sin.

4. Subjective Appropriation of Salvation

I suggested above that the author of 2 Peter understands Jesus as having purchased his followers from enslavement to corruption by his death, even though the author does not say explicitly that Jesus' death was the purchase price. However, the author does speak explicitly about the way followers of Jesus appropriate this salvation. In 1,3 the author says that Jesus' divine power has given them everything pertaining to life and piety through recognition of the one who called them by his own glory and excellence (v. 3), i.e. Jesus⁽³¹⁾. Jesus has done this by first calling them and then having them answer the call by recognizing him as savior.

The first verse of 2 Peter says that the readers have received faith from Jesus. Faith is a synonym for recognition of Jesus. Specifically, they have received faith equal in honor to that of Peter and others, through the justice of Jesus.

The author presupposes that Jesus' death has transferred human beings from enslavement to corruption to his own service. However, this transfer does not take effect until it is known to have occurred. Prior to such

⁽³⁰⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 182-184.

⁽³¹⁾ BIGG, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 253-254; KELLY, *Peter and Jude*, 300-301; BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 178.

knowledge, human beings continue to serve their previous master because they do not know they have a new one. For the author of 2 Peter faith, i.e. recognition of Jesus, is absolutely crucial.

The author and readers have received faith (1,1.5) and have recognized Jesus as their new Master (1,3; 2,20). However, as 2,20 implies, it is possible to have escaped slavery to the defilements of the world by recognizing Jesus and then return to one's former master. Jesus' purchase of human beings from their former master, and their recognition of him as their new master, does not eliminate the possibility that they serve their old master. They can undo their salvation. To avoid this their recognition of Jesus must be ongoing. This is why ethics is necessary.

In 1,5-8 the author urges the readers to progress in virtue (vv. 5-7) because having these things and increasing in them makes them fruitful for recognition of Jesus. Those who have been set free from sin by recognizing Jesus need to persist in that freedom from sin, which is an ongoing recognition of Jesus. This is how they make secure their call and election (1,10), which is the starting point of their salvation (cf. v. 3). Those who do this will receive entrance into the eternal kingdom of Jesus (1,11). For 2 Peter ethics is a matter of continuing in the recognition of Jesus which is the appropriation of the salvation Jesus accomplished. Thus the author wishes that the readers continue their recognition of Jesus in 1,2 and 3,18. An immoral life is a denial of Jesus and a return to slavery. On the other hand, persisting in lives of holiness and piety is salvation.

5. Ethics

Käsemann criticizes the ethical teaching of 2 Peter, saying that it is not linked with justification⁽³²⁾. However, as we have just seen, 2 Peter presents Jesus as having saved his followers from slavery to corruption and defilement, and argues that the readers must continue in this freedom⁽³³⁾. Jesus' followers accept salvation from him by faith (1,1), which is equivalent to recognition of God and/or Jesus (1,3; 2,20-21); this recognition is the source of peace (1,2). This recognition must continue and develop through a life of virtue (1,8; 3,18). Likewise, faith must lead to virtue (1,5-7)⁽³⁴⁾.

One general name for this life of virtue is justice. This is the virtue that characterizes our God and savior Jesus Christ (1,2). Jesus' justice is manifested in giving everyone faith equal in honor, i.e. treating them fairly and without favoritism⁽³⁵⁾. It is the virtue of which Noah, saved from the flood, was herald (2,5)⁽³⁶⁾. Christian life can be called the way of justice

⁽³²⁾ KÄSEMAN, "Apologia", 184.

⁽³³⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 53-60, says that for 2 Peter the saving action of God in the past is the basis for ethical life in the present. He also observes that the emphasis on ethics in 2 Peter is elicited by the need to counteract the ethical laxity of the false teachers it opposes.

⁽³⁴⁾ According to Philo, *De ebr.* 23, those who act against virtue bring their souls to utter corruption.

⁽³⁵⁾ BIGG, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 250; KELLY, *Peter and Jude*, 297; BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 168.

⁽³⁶⁾ Philo, *De Abr.* 56; *De praemiis* 22, says that Noah was saved from the destruction of the deluge because of his justice.

(2,21). The new heavens and earth that the followers of Jesus await will be a world in which justice dwells (3,13). In 1,13 the author describes his behavior as just, and in 2,7-8 he refers to Lot as just. The author seems to see Lot as a type of his readers. Just as Lot was saved from Sodom and Gomorrah when they were destroyed by fire, the readers will be saved when the present heavens and earth are destroyed by fire. Like them, Lot was a just man living among those engaged in licentiousness and lawless deeds.

The most specific information about the virtue to which 2 Peter calls the reader is found in 1,5-7. Here the author first of all urges the readers to be eager to grow in virtue (v. 5). The admonition to eagerness is repeated in 1,10 and 3,14. The author himself manifests this eagerness in 1,15. The author then continues to specify the virtues in which the readers should be eager to grow.

The readers begin with faith (cf. 1,1). By their faith they should add excellence (v. 5). This is a virtue attributed to Jesus in 1,3, and seems to be a general term for the virtue to which the author calls the readers here⁽³⁷⁾. By their excellence the readers should add knowledge (v. 5). This is another indication that the recognition or knowledge of God and Jesus that the readers have in faith must grow. Many see a difference between γνῶσις and ἐπίγνῶσις⁽³⁸⁾. However, the parallel between 2,20 and 3,18 suggests that there is little difference in meaning between the two words.

We have already seen that recognition of Jesus is the way that his followers appropriate the salvation Jesus accomplished. The importance of knowledge for the author of 2 Peter is also indicated by his frequent references to it⁽³⁹⁾. In addition, the author speaks of forgetfulness as the opposite of virtue (1,9), and speaks of his purpose as reminding the readers⁽⁴⁰⁾. He says that the readers are established in the truth (1,12) and calls Christianity the way of truth (2,2).

In 1,6 the author says that by their knowledge the readers should add self-control. Self-control is the opposite of both desire and pursuit of pleasure on the one hand, and greed on the other⁽⁴¹⁾. The readers have escaped the corruption in the world by desire (1,4). The Lord will punish those going after the flesh in desire of defilement (2,10), who will appear in the last days (3,2). They use desires of the flesh to entice those who have escaped them (2,18). The false teachers also pursue pleasure (2,13). They are characterized by greed (2,3,14).

Licentiousness is equated with desire in 2,18. The false teachers are also said to be licentious in 2,2. In 2,7 licentiousness characterizes Sodom and Gomorrah. In 2,14 the false teachers are described as having eyes full

⁽³⁷⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 185-186; J.H. NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 37C; New York 1993) 156.

⁽³⁸⁾ BIGG, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 253; BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 186; NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude*, 149.

⁽³⁹⁾ Cf. 2 Peter 1,12.14.16.20; 2,9; 3,3.17.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ 2 Peter 1,12.13.15; 3,1.

⁽⁴¹⁾ NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude*, 159-160. BIGG, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 258, sees it only as opposite to greed; KELLY, *Peter and Jude*, 306, and BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 186, see it as opposite to licentiousness.

of adultery. These are other references to the desire that is the opposite of self-control.

By their self-control the readers should add endurance (1,6), perhaps specifically of any delay in the return of Jesus⁽⁴²⁾. This is synonymous with being established in the truth (1,12) and having stability (3,17). The opposite is the instability that characterizes the author's opponents (3,16) and those who follow them (2,14).

By their endurance the readers should add piety (1,6). This is the opposite of the slander that characterizes the false teachers. In 2,10 the false teachers are said to slander the glorious ones. In 2,12 the false teachers are said to slander what they do not understand, probably expressing in different words the same idea as 2,10. By contrast in 2,11 the angels are said to refrain from slanderous judgement of the false teachers. According to 2,2, because many will follow the false teachers, the way of truth will be slandered.

2 Pet 1,3 says that Jesus' divine power has given the author and readers everything pertaining to piety. 3,11 says that in view of the coming end the readers should live in holiness and piety. 2,9 says that the Lord knows how to save the pious. On the other hand 2,5 says that God destroyed the world of the impious by the flood. 2,6 says that Sodom and Gomorrah are a sign of things that are going to happen to the impious. And 3,7 says that the present heavens and earth are treasured up for the day of destruction of impious human beings.

The virtues of self-control and piety are the principal antidotes to the problem presented by the false teachers. Piety is the opposite of their false teaching about eschatological matters; self-control is the opposite of the moral laxity that flows from this teaching.

By their piety the readers should add brotherly love, and by their brotherly love, love (1,7). These are the pinnacle of Christian virtue.

6. *The Completion of Salvation*

Jesus' salvation of his followers from slavery to corruption is a present reality, but not a final one. At present it is always possible to return to slavery; hence the need for ethics. Salvation only becomes final when this world is destroyed at the end of time. Those enslaved to corruption will be destroyed along with it. Those who have been freed from slavery to corruption will then be definitively free.

The end of the world not only completes salvation in this negative sense, it also completes the life of freedom begun through recognition of Jesus. This positive dimension is indicated in 1,3 where the author says that Jesus' divine power has given them everything pertaining to life and piety. By setting them free from impiety, Jesus has given them what they need for piety. And this piety will bring them to life.

In 1,4 the author says that Jesus has given promises in order that through these promises the readers might be θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. Not

⁽⁴²⁾ BIGG, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 258; KELLY, *Peter and Jude*, 307.

only do they look forward to life as a result of piety, they are also destined to share divine nature⁽⁴³⁾. The most salient characteristic of divine nature is incorruptibility; the immediately following reference to having escaped the corruption in the world makes it very likely that the author equates sharing divine nature with becoming incorruptible⁽⁴⁴⁾. If so, the hope of sharing divine nature is equivalent to that of putting on incorruptibility and immortality in 1 Cor 15,50-55. This will occur when they enter the eternal kingdom of Jesus (2 Pet 1,11).

The promises of definitive freedom from corruption and entry into Jesus' eternal kingdom are part of the prophetic word that points forward to the end of the world (1,19), which is found in scripture (1,20). Specifically, they are found in the letters of Paul (3,15-16). What is promised includes the return of Jesus (3,4) and the establishment of new heavens and earth (3,13). The author of 2 Peter emphasizes that the future completion of salvation has been promised by Jesus in order to convince his readers to maintain this expectation.

7. Eschatology

Käsemann criticizes 2 Peter for not making eschatology central to its theology, but using it merely to solve the problem of theodicy and to encourage morality⁽⁴⁵⁾. However, eschatology is central to the theology of 2 Peter in that it functions as the completion of the salvation God has begun in Jesus⁽⁴⁶⁾. We have seen that ethics for 2 Peter, as for Paul, is a matter of behaving so as not to undo salvation. 2 Peter's eschatological expectations present the ultimate consequences of one's ethical choices. As a warrant for ethics, the eschatology of 2 Peter is soteriological because ethics is soteriological.

One element of 2 Peter's beliefs about the end of the world, and the first mentioned in the letter, is that Jesus will come again at the end. In 1,16 the author says that his teaching about the *δύναμις καὶ παρουσία* of Jesus did not derive from myths. There is another reference to this in 3,4 where the author quotes his opponents as asking, 'Where is the promise of his *παρουσία*?' It is clear that the author, like other early Christians, expected the return of Jesus at the end of the world. However, the author does not say why Jesus will return or what he will do at his return; the author simply says that Jesus will return. Perhaps the author presumes that

⁽⁴³⁾ Like the idea that followers of Jesus escape the corruption in the world, the idea that they become sharers of divine nature expresses the meaning of Christianity in terms taken from dualistic Greek philosophical and religious thought. However, these terms are given new meaning (BIGG, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 255-256; KELLY, *Peter and Jude*, 302-304; KÄSEMANN, "Apologia", 184, does not think the terms have been given new meaning). Just as for 2 Peter the corruption in the world derives from desire, not from the nature of the world, so the followers of Jesus do not share divine nature by essence, but receive a share in divine nature as a gift.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ FORNBERG, *Early Church*, 86-88; BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 180-181; NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude*, 157-158.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ KÄSEMANN, "Apologia", 185.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Cf. BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 59-66.

at his παρουσία Jesus' kingdom will be fully established (cf. 1,11) as Paul says explicitly in 1 Cor 15,23-25.

In 3,12 the author speaks of the παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρας, another way of referring to the events of the end. This is apparently the same as the day of the Lord (3,10). This is the day on which the heavens and earth will be destroyed by fire and replaced by new heavens and a new earth in which justice dwells (3,13). The author has much more to say about this.

The present heavens and earth have been treasured up by the word of God for fire, held for the day of judgment and destruction of impious people (3,7). The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire was a sign of what was going to happen to the impious (2,6). The idea that the present heavens and earth have been treasured up for fire by the word of God probably implies that this is based on prophecy. Several passages might have been understood to predict this⁽⁴⁷⁾. The idea that the eschatological fire destroys the present heavens and earth might have been seen as implied in the prediction of new heavens and earth in Isa 66,22, following upon vv. 15-16. However, this idea also has significant parallels in Iranian and especially Stoic ideas about a conflagration that ends the world⁽⁴⁸⁾.

On the day of the Lord the heavens will pass away with a loud noise and the elements, burning, will be dissolved, and earth and the works in it will be disclosed (3,10). The physical universe will be dismantled. At the same time, the truth about the earth and its works will be made known. The slavery to corruption of the earth and some of its inhabitants will be clear when they undergo corruption. Likewise, the freedom from corruption of those who do not will be clear. The dissolution of the universe at the end is thus a motive for living virtuously (3,11). On the day of God the heavens, burning, will be dissolved, and the elements, burning, will melt (3,12).

The return of Jesus, the destruction of the present heavens and earth in fire, and their replacement with new heavens and a new earth, will happen unexpectedly, like the coming of a thief (3,10, quoting 1 Thess 5,2). Moreover, it is impossible to tell even approximately when this will happen because time is not the same for God as for humans (3,8, quoting Ps 90,4). Further, God is patient because God wants everyone to repent and be found among the pious at the end of the world (3,9,15).

In 2 Pet 1,19 the author pictures the coming of the day of the Lord, foretold in scripture, as the dawning of day and the rising of the morning

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Deut 32,22; Mal 3,19; Isa 66,15-16; Zeph 1,18. Justin understands Deut 32,22 this way in *1 Apol.* 60.8. BAUCKHAM *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 301, argues that 2 Peter is immediately dependent on a Jewish apocalypse that in turn depended on these passages. The idea of an eschatological conflagration can be seen in many Jewish and Christian writings, such as 1 QH iii 19-36 (*ibid.*, 300). Josephus, *Ant.* 1.70, says that Adam predicted destruction of the universe, at one time by fire, at another by water.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 300-301; NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude*, 240-241. In the Stoic view, the conflagration is followed by regeneration of the world. Bauckham also mentions an idea found in Plato, *Timaeus* 22C-E, and elsewhere, that the world undergoes recurrent destructions by flood and fire alternately (*ibid.*, 301).

star⁽⁴⁹⁾. The image of the morning star may allude simultaneously to Num 24,17 and to Hellenistic astrological interests⁽⁵⁰⁾. Expectation of the end of the world does provide a negative incentive to virtue, namely to avoid being destroyed with the impious. However, the expectation also provides a positive incentive; it will be the dawning of day after a dark night.

The return of Jesus and the end of the world are mainly presented as God's final punishment of the impious. However, insofar as the situation of the pious is like that of Lot, distressed by the behavior of the impious (2,7-8), the punishment of the impious will benefit the pious. The punishment of the impious will also eliminate their temptation of the pious (2,18). In addition, righteousness will dwell in the new heavens and earth that will replace the present heavens and earth when they are brought to an end (3,13, alluding to Isa 32,16).

Athenaeum of Ohio
6616 Beechmont Avenue
Cincinnati, OH 45230 (USA)

Terrance CALLAN

SUMMARY

2 Peter presents Jesus as savior in that he purchased his followers from slavery to corruption and the defilements of the world. Human beings became slaves of corruption through erroneous thinking and following the desires of the flesh, i.e. sin. Jesus' followers have been released from this servitude by their recognition that Jesus has purchased them from their previous owner and is now their master. The ethical teaching of 2 Peter is based on continuing in the freedom from slavery to sin that has come through Jesus. The eschatological teaching of 2 Peter describes the completion of salvation, the culmination of both slavery to sin and following Jesus.

The Pauline character of the soteriology of 2 Peter is very marked. In view of the author's claim (in 2 Pet 3,16) that Paul agrees with what the author has said, this is not surprising.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Contra KELLY, *Peter and Jude*, 322, the final phrase of 1,19, i.e. ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, should be taken with the following verse to indicate where the understanding of the readers occurs, not where the morning star rises.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC), 226; NEYREY, *2 Peter, Jude*, 183-184.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Paul HEGER, *The Three Altar Laws*. Developments in the Sacrificial Cult in Practice and Theology. Political and Economic Background (BZAW 279). Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1999. xii-463 p. 16 × 23,5. DM 198

In dem vorliegenden umfassenden Werk setzt sich der Verfasser mit den Altargesetzen Ex 20,21-23, Dtn 27,2-8 und Ex 27,1-8 auseinander, um auf dieser Basis Einsichten in die Geschichte und Religion Israels und Judas von seiner nomadischen Vergangenheit bis in die Zeit nach der Zerstörung des 2. Tempels zu erlangen. Als Erkenntnisziel der Studie formuliert er: “a) the substantiation of the developmental process at work in the sacrificial cult, b) the validation of the scholarly assertion discrediting the existence of a ‘bronze altar’ in the desert Tabernacle, and c) the elucidation of the conceptual process by which the ideological and practical replacement of the sacrificial system with an entirely different type of cult, recital and prayer, was effected” (391). Dazu dienen die Einzeluntersuchungen in den folgenden Kapiteln: 1. The Relationship between the Altar Laws in Exod 20 and Deut 27; 2. Comparison and Contrast between the Two Pericopes with respect to their Mythological Vision and Historical Setting; 3. The Correlation between Deut 27,5-6 and 1 Kings 5,31-32; 6,7 and 7,9-11; 4. Archeological Evidence; 5. The Bronze Altar: Exod 27,1-8; 6. Excursus: Exod 27,2: “Make Its Horns at Each of the Four Corners [Exod 27,2]”; 7. The Bronze Altar – Real or Fictional?; 8. Josiah’s Reform; 9. Development in the Sacrificial Cult in Practice and Theology. Nach einer Zusammenfassung der Arbeitsergebnisse werden diese durch drei Exkurse zu einem Vergleich von MT und LXX in 1 Kön 6,7-22, zur Hermeneutik der Bücher Esra und Nehemia hinsichtlich der Arbeitsbeschränkung am Sabbat und dem Mischehenverbot und zum Priestertum des Jehojada ergänzt.

Die vielen wichtigen Einzelbeobachtungen des Verfassers können in einer Rezension nicht adäquat wiedergegeben werden, so dass ich hier auf die Lektüre des Buches selbst verweisen muß. Ich sehe gerade in diesen Einzelbeobachtungen, speziell zu den Formulierungen, zu den literarischen Vergleichen und zu den Inhalten der Altargesetze die große Stärke und den Erkenntnisgewinn des Bandes. Nachteilig empfinde ich, dass alttestamentliche Texte zu schnell durch zu rabbinische Texte erläutert werden. Damit ist gleich ein zweiter Schwachpunkt des Buches angesprochen. Leider unterbleiben Seitenblicke auf die Archäologie in Syrien-Palästina (außerhalb von Juda und Israel), sowie auf Ritualtexte bzw. Inschriften, die Tempel und Altäre erwähnen und ihre Bedeutung im Kult hervorheben, vollständig. Vor

allem ugaritische, phönizische und aramäische Texte hätten zur Exegese alttestamentlicher Altargesetze noch diverse Gesichtspunkte beitragen können. Nicht unproblematisch ist dann stellenweise auch die Verwendung veralteter wissenschaftlicher Paradigmen aus der Geschichte Israels. So ist es mißlich in Bezug auf das Altargesetz Ex 20,22 zu lesen "that the origin of this pericope seems to be in the early nomadic period" (32; vgl. auch 77-87, 124-125, 391). Bedauerlich ist auch, dass eine Beschäftigung mit dem Briefwechsel der Judäo-Aramäer von Elephantine hinsichtlich der von ihnen beim Hohenpriester des 2. Tempels und beim persischen Gouverneur von Yehud angestrebten Erlaubnis des Tempelneubaues in Elephantine und dem Erfolg, zumindest ein *byt mdbh*? zu errichten, ohne allerdings Brandopfer darzubringen (*TAD* A 4.5[?]; 4.7-4.9; vgl. auch 4.10), völlig fehlt. Insofern liegt eine eher binnenalttestamentliche Arbeit vor uns, die zwar die Rezeptionsgeschichte bis zum Talmud nicht vernachlässigt und auch die Exegese der alttestamentlichen Texte durch die gelegentlichen Exkurse in die Palästina-Archäologie stellenweise durchbricht. Es wäre aber wünschenswert gewesen, die Detailexegese durch eine engere Vernetzung mit Erkenntnissen aus der Religionsgeschichte Syrien-Palästinas bzw. der Judäo-Aramäer von Elephantine zu verbinden.

Trotz dieser hier angeführten Einschränkungen liegt eine einschlägige Studie zu den Altargesetzen und z.T. auch zu Altären im Alten Testament vor, die bei der weiteren exegetischen und religionsgeschichtlichen Erforschung des Alten Testaments unbedingt Beachtung verdient.

Eberhard-Karls-Universität
Theologikum, Liebermeisterstraße 12
D-72076 Tübingen

Herbert NIEHR

Kristin DE TROYER, *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther*. Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1-17, LXX 8: 1-17, and AT 7:14-41 (SBLSCS 48). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. 453 p. 14 × 23. \$59.95

El libro que presentamos en esta recensión es, ante todo, una prueba manifiesta de la complejidad de la llamada Septuaginta (LXX) o Biblia griega del AT, fruto colectivo de traductores anónimos del hebreo/araméo al griego y de autores que escribieron directamente en griego para las comunidades judías de la diáspora, especialmente en Egipto. El libro de Ester es un ejemplo preclaro de la historia literaria de la Biblia, puesto que a nosotros han llegado testimonios de él en hebreo y en griego. El texto en hebreo (TM) contiene la parte llamada proto-canónica del libro de Ester; la traducción griega LXX (llamada también texto B y o'), sigue relativamente fiel al TM, al que se le añaden seis grandes Adiciones (A-F), que son las partes déutero-canónicas de Ester. La segunda traducción griega de Ester o Texto Alfa (TA/AT), al que también se le llama texto "Luciánico" o L, es un texto más corto que la LXX.

Kristin De Troyer hace un estudio concienzudo de una parte del libro de Ester, como ella misma especifica en el subtítulo del libro. El libro consta de cinco capítulos en los que la autora estudia sucesivamente Est 8,1-17TM, sus correspondientes traducciones griegas (LXX y TA) y parte de la Adición E, como se nos ha transmitido en LXX y en TA.

En el capítulo 1 (1-87), De Troyer centra perfectamente su trabajo, presentándonos el *status quaestionis* de los estudios sobre el texto hebreo y griego del libro de Ester. En un primer apartado (2-15), hace un recuento de las ediciones que se han hecho del texto de Ester en general, en hebreo (TM) y griego (LXX y TA), con atención especial a las Adiciones griegas y sus diferentes designaciones. Un segundo apartado (15-37) lo dedica a la *historia de la investigación* del libro de Ester durante más de dos siglos, desde los primeros estudios de J.G. Eichhorn (en 1781) y L.B. De Rossi (en 1782) hasta los más recientes de R. Hanhart (1966), de C.A. Moore (1971), D.J.A. Clines (1984), M.V. Fox (1991), K.H. Jobes (1996), etc. El apartado tercero (37-71) contiene una *evaluación crítica de las hipótesis más importantes* que se han formulado en el siglo XX acerca de la génesis y formación del libro de Ester en hebreo y en griego. La autora determina en el apartado 4 (71-78) el ámbito de la presente investigación, a saber, el capítulo 8 del TM y LXX y del texto paralelo en el TA, su capítulo 7, con atención especial a la Adición E. El apartado 5 (78-87) cierra el capítulo 1 con la determinación de la metodología que va a utilizar en el estudio comparativo de Est 8,1-17TM y LXX, y su paralelo en TA: 7,14-41.

El capítulo 2 está dedicado al estudio del TM de Est 8,1-17 (87-173). Empieza con una traducción personal del texto (87-90), a la que sigue un análisis muy detallado verso a verso (90-168). El esquema que utiliza la autora en este capítulo lo repetirá en los capítulos siguientes. De Troyer propone en primer lugar el texto hebreo; sigue después una exégesis exhaustiva de cada verso con referencias explícitas a todos los pasajes paralelos del libro de Ester, convirtiéndose así en una verdadera concordancia de vocabulario y temas, enriquecidos éstos con frecuentes *Excursus*. El capítulo 2 se completa con un estudio más personal de la redacción y composición de Est 8,1-17TM (169-173): Las escenas que componen el capítulo se encadenan de manera que el centro lo ocupa la figura clave de Ester, y Mardoqueo el marco o exterior para realce de Ester. Est 8TM utiliza claramente material de Est 1-7, por esto De Troyer puede defender, en controversia con M.V. Fox, que Est 8TM es un capítulo reelaborado a conciencia por el mismo autor del resto de la narración de Ester.

A propósito de este capítulo, y también de los siguientes, hemos de subrayar la sobreabundante riqueza bibliográfica de que hace gala la autora en las notas a pie de página. De Troyer recoge los más variados puntos de vista de los autores de este último siglo, discutiéndolos todos y presentando al final el suyo propio, que suele ser equilibrado.

Est 8,1-17 (LXX) es el objeto analizado en el capítulo 3. De Troyer aplica en este análisis el mismo método que ha empleado en el capítulo 2: precede una traducción personal (175-178), sigue el análisis de cada uno de los versos, encabezados por el texto en hebreo y griego (178-269). En el estudio de los vocablos griegos, la autora hace constar todos los lugares del libro de Ester, incluidas las Adiciones, donde aparece cada uno de ellos. Después de esto

presenta algunas conclusiones acerca de la técnica de traducción y narración (270-278), por ejemplo: la Vorlage de LXX es, sin duda, el TM, pero reelaborado y adaptado a las circunstancias históricas que vive el autor; Mardoqueo aparece como sumo sacerdote (como Jonatán y Simón en 1 Mac); Amán es enemigo de los judíos y del rey; el decreto del rey es comentado por el autor, convirtiéndose en la Adición E, sin la cual nunca existió la LXX del libro de Ester; el segundo decreto del rey permite a los judíos vivir según sus leyes, inspirándose su autor en los decretos de Antíoco IV Epífanes y de Antíoco V Eupátor. Éste es el fundamento de la autora para fijar la fecha probable de composición de EstLXX en Jerusalén, llevada después a Alejandría para introducir la fiesta de Purim. El término *post quem* sería el año 164 a.C. y el *ante quem* el 78-77 a.C., coincidiendo con E.J. Bickerman.

El capítulo 4 trata de una parte del TA, a saber, de Est 7,14-41 (279-349). El TA cambia deliberadamente la secuencia narrativa de LXX, de la que claramente depende. El centro no lo ocupa Ester, sino Mardoqueo, presentado como el salvador del rey y del pueblo. Él es el que pide al rey que destruya la carta de Amán, cosa que consigue (Adición E); él escribe, además, una segunda carta en nombre del rey en la que se garantizan los derechos de su pueblo en todo el Imperio. De Troyer demuestra que el "sabor hebreo" del TA no proviene de ningún presunto texto hebreo, ahora perdido y distinto de TM, sino de su *Vorlage*, la LXX, tal y como ahora la conocemos, incluidos la Adición E y los capítulos 8-10; se alinea, pues, con R. Hanhart en contra de la opinión de Clines y de Fox. No es fácil seguir el hilo conductor del discurso de la autora en este intrincado capítulo 4. Un resumen de los temas tratados en él nos lo ofrece ella misma en las páginas 347-349.

El capítulo 5 fija su atención en la Adición E según aparece en la LXX y en el TA. La autora presenta en primer lugar un buen apretado resumen de la historia de la investigación de las grandes Adiciones en el libro de Ester (351-363) desde las primeras propuestas de L.B. De Rossi (1782) y J.G. Eichhorn (1795) hasta las más recientes de nuestros días de K.H. Jobes (1996). Aterrizza después De Troyer en el estudio particular de la Adición E según el TA (363-377) y la LXX (377-393), comparándolas con toda meticulosidad y deduciendo con rotundidad que no son dos los autores: uno de LXX y otro de la Adición E, sino uno solo, el de LXX con las Adiciones, ya que jamás ha existido la LXX o el TA sin la Adición E.

El estudio propiamente dicho termina con la formulación de una serie de conclusiones y proposiciones muy desiguales en valor (395-403). Unas son firmes por ser fruto directo de la investigación, por ejemplo: que el traductor de LXX del libro de Ester interpretó el texto hebreo, introduciendo nuevas dimensiones a la narración. Otras son menos probables, como las que relacionan la composición del libro con las cartas de Antíoco IV y de Antíoco V. Las últimas son más originales, muy atrevidas y, en la misma proporción, menos probables: atribuyen la autoría del TA al mismo Filón. Escribe la autora: «Sospechamos que el autor del TA estaba pensando en la figura de Agripa, cuando compuso su obra. Así, Mardoqueo se identificaría con Agripa I, Amán con Flaco, el inestable gobernador de Alejandría, y el rey Asuero con el emperador Claudio ... El TA habría sido escrito en Roma, alrededor del año 40-41 d.C. por un autor judío ... familiarizado con la narración de Ester según la forma de la LXX, reescrita por él, que pensaba en Agripa, el

nuevo libertador del pueblo judío ... Es posible que el TA de Ester fuera uno de los cinco libros de Filón que versaban sobre la cuestión judía (durante el tiempo de Gayo) de los que solamente han sobrevivido la *Legatio ad Gaium* y *In Flaccum*» (402). La autora misma se da cuenta de que no tiene argumentos para demostrar su alucinante teoría, por lo que ésta no pasa de ser una mera hipótesis de trabajo, pero con la ventaja de que no tendrá que cambiar la abreviatura TA/AT para la nueva significación "Texto de Agripa". Concede, sin embargo, que el TA de Ester ya no puede pertenecer al grupo privilegiado de textos griegos, equiparables a la LXX, sino al Corpus griego de la literatura judía, junto a las obras de Filón, de Flavio Josefo, de 3 y 4 Macabeos, etc. Estamos muy lejos de las conclusiones a las que han llegado tantos autores, estudiosos del libro de Ester en general y de su TA en particular, como son, por ejemplo, R. Hanhart, C.A. Moore, D.J.A. Clines, M.V. Fox o K.H. Jobes. A este respecto, De Troyer con este trabajo, tan valioso por otros muchos motivos, hace un flaco favor a un texto tan venerable como el TA de Ester, al que con un solo golpe de timón hace bajar muchos peldaños en su categoría.

La autora completa el estudio con varios apéndices que pueden ayudar considerablemente a la lectura de una obra tan complicada. El primero contiene una sinopsis a tres columnas de los tres textos estudiados: el TM, la LXX y el TA (405-411); el segundo ofrece la rica Bibliografía, a la que se remite constantemente en las numerosas notas a pie de página; cierra el libro un amplio Índice de citas bíblicas (441-453).

Facultad de Teología
Apartado 2056
E-18080 Granada

José VÍLCHEZ

Matthias HENZE, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar. The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 61). Leiden, Brill, 1999. xii-295 p. 16 × 24,5. Dfl. 169,69 – \$90.00

Der Vf., der als Assistant Professor of Religious Studies an der Rice University, Houston, lehrt, legt mit diesem Buch sein größeres Erstlingswerk vor, das auf seine Dissertation an der Harvard University zurückgeht. Nach einer Einleitung (1-7) enthält das Buch vier Kapitel und drei Appendices. Das erste Kapitel behandelt Dan 4 in den beiden Versionen, in denen es im Masoretischen Text und in der Septuaginta vorliegt (9-49). Das zweite Kapitel geht der babylonischen Vorgeschichte der Motive von Dan 4 nach (51-99). Danach bietet das dritte Kapitel (101-141) die jüdische, das vierte (143-201) die christliche Auslegungsgeschichte des Danielkapitels an ausgewählten Beispielen bis in die Spätantike (aufbauend auf D. Satran), wobei erstere sich fast ganz auf die rabbinische Tradition konzentriert, letztere den Ton vor allem auf die syrische Tradition legt, und nur exkurshaft

auf die westliche Kirche (Hippolyt und Tertullian) hinausblickt. Die Kapitel, die einen gewaltigen zeitlichen (ca. 600 v. Chr. bis 600 n. Chr.) und geographischen (Babylonien bis Rom) Horizont abschreiten, stehen relativ selbständig nebeneinander und können nach Meinung des Vf.s auch je für sich gelesen werden (5). Erst die Zusammenfassung (203-215) sucht ein einendes Band um Text-, Motiv-, und Auslegungsgeschichte zu knüpfen: Den auffälligen Befund der Auslegungsgeschichte, daß die jüdische Tradition die Verwandlung Nebukadnezars zum Tier als Ausdruck eines beispielhaften Gerichtes Gottes über die grenzenlose Hybris des babylonischen Königs interpretiert und damit immer schon Rom im Blick hat, während die christliche Auslegung seine Zurückverwandlung zum Menschen als Musterbeispiel echter und wirkungsvoller Buße für Christen ausdeutet, sieht Henze schon in dem Nebeneinander der beiden Versionen des Bibeltextes selbst angelegt: In der aramäischen Version des Danielkapitels stehe das Gericht Gottes, in der griechischen die Reue des Königs im Vordergrund. Seine These lautet darum: "The interpretative process on either side is not a phenomenon secondary to the biblical text: the biblical versions themselves are already an integral part of the interpretative process" (210).

Allerdings wird diese interessante These dem historischen Befund nur teilweise gerecht, und der Vf. ist klug genug, dies auch gleich zuzugeben (210). Denn wohl benutzten Hippolyt und Tertullian, nicht aber die syrischen Kirchenväter die Septuagintaversion von Dan 4 für ihre Auslegungen; folgt doch die Peschitta weitgehend der aramäischen Erzählfassung. Warum letztere dennoch gegen den jüdischen Auslegungstyp, der sogar noch vom persischen Christ Aphrat geteilt wurde, einen eigenen christlichen schufen, wird bei Henze nicht ganz einsichtig. Er deutet nur an, daß bei den Auslegungen neben den Anlagen im Bibeltext natürlich auch zeitgeschichtliche Tendenzen und religiöse Interessen eine Rolle spielten.

Der erste Appendix (217-243) stellt einen interessanten, ehemals selbständigen Aufsatz über die Autorität und Funktion des Danielbuches in der Qumrangemeinde dar. Damit deutet der Vf. nur an, daß dessen Verständnis und Wertung in den verschiedenen Gruppen des Judentums wahrscheinlich unterschiedlicher war, als dies jetzt für Kapitel 4 herauskommt. Der zweite Appendix bietet eine Synopse der beiden Versionen von Dan 4, der dritte eine Homilie des Jakob von Serug über Dan 4, jeweils in englischer Übersetzung.

Beeindruckend an dem Buch ist die Weite seines Horizontes und die Gelehrsamkeit seines Verfassers. Er verfügt nicht nur über die "normalen" Fertigkeiten eines biblischen Exegeten, sondern kennt sich auch aus in der babylonischen Umwelt, dazu in der rabbinischen Tradition, und ebenfalls in der alten Kirchengeschichte; zuletzt entpuppt er sich auch noch als ein Fachmann für Qumran. Das ist für ein Erstlingswerk bemerkenswert. So ist das Buch eine Fundgrube für alle, die sich mit dem Danielbuch im Speziellen, oder mit der antiken Auslegungsgeschichte der Bibel im Allgemeinen beschäftigen. Die Fülle des Materials, die es einbringt und bearbeitet, ist eindrucksvoll. Seine vielen interessanten Einzelbeobachtungen in verschiedenster Richtung lassen sich im Rahmen einer solchen Besprechung nicht angemessen referieren.

Doch macht der Reichtum des Buchs zugleich auch seine Schwäche aus:

Es macht einen etwas zusammengesetzten Eindruck und es fehlt ihm eine zentrale These, auf die das ganze zuläuft. Statt dessen begnügt sich der Vf. zu den verschiedenen Themenbereichen mit Einzelthesen, die aber, wegen der großen thematischen Breite, nicht immer so detailliert ausgearbeitet, durchdacht und ertragreich sind, wie es wünschenswert wäre.

Im ersten Kapitel setzt sich der Vf. ausführlich mit dem Verhältnis auseinander, in dem Dan 4MT und Dan 4LXX zueinander stehen. Mit Recht wehrt er sich dagegen, die beiden Erzählversionen in ein direktes literarisches Abhängigkeitsverhältnis zu bringen, sei es, daß man mit D. Satran die Priorität der aramäischen Version (so die Mehrheitsmeinung) oder mit L. Wills die der griechischen Version behauptet. Seine These lautet: "neither the MT nor the Old Greek has served as the *Vorlage* for the other. Instead both versions have preserved double literary traditions" (40). Er schlägt vor, das Verhältnis der beiden Texte nicht in einem Stammbaum-, sondern einem Synopsenmodell zu denken (47) und verweist dazu auf die spätere jüdische Hekhalot-Literatur, die sich durch hochgradige Wandelbarkeit auszeichne (44-49).

Hierzu möchte ich folgendes anmerken: Henze ist zuzustimmen, daß das Verhältnis der beiden Versionen von Dan 4 nicht unter textkritischer, sondern unter überlieferungsgeschichtlicher Methodik bestimmt werden muß, da es sich nicht um kleinere Veränderungen eines Grundtextes, sondern um zwei eigenständige und je in sich stimmige Erzählversionen handelt. Ich habe dies schon 1988 (*Der Gott des Daniel: Untersuchungen zu Daniel 4-6 in der Septuagintafassung sowie zu Komposition und Theologie des aramäischen Danielbuches* [SBS 131; Stuttgart]) in einer ausführlichen vergleichenden Auslegung von Dan 4-6 nachgewiesen; dieses Ergebnis wird durch Henze nun nochmals bestätigt.

Eigenartigerweise geht Henze auf mein Buch nur ganz am Rande ein, obgleich es 75 Seiten über sein Thema handelt. Es scheint ihm erst nach weitgehender Ausarbeitung seiner Arbeit bekannt geworden zu sein. Ob er den Kern meiner These, nämlich daß Dan 4-6*LXX eine feste Erzählsammlung darstellt, der gegenüber der aramäischen Danielapokalypse Dan 2-7* überlieferungsgeschichtliche Priorität zukommt, zur Kenntnis genommen hat, läßt sich aus den drei knappen Fußnoten nicht erkennen. Jedenfalls diskutiert er sie nicht.

Doch ist Henzes Lösung, Dan 4MT/LXX repräsentierten zwei parallele Erzähltraditionen, letztlich unbefriedigend, da beide Texte trotz aller Abweichungen so viele Übereinstimmungen aufweisen (vgl. Vv. 16b.24.27 u.ö.), daß man um die Annahme eines gemeinsamen Vorläufers nicht herumkommt. "Stammbaum" und "Synopse" sind ja keine Alternativmodelle, wie der Vf. unterstellt; vielmehr soll eine Synopse ja gerade der Aufklärung überlieferungsgeschichtlicher Zusammenhänge und Verzweigungen dienen. Diese gilt übrigens auch für die große Tübinger Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur von P. Schäfer (1981), die der Vf. als Vorbild für sein Modell heranzieht.

Zudem muß die Frage gestellt werden, ob der Vergleich mit diesem Zweig der mystischen jüdischen Literatur wirklich sinnvoll ist, handelt es sich hier doch um hochgradig fluktuierende, spekulative Auslegungsliteratur, deren Textüberlieferung sich in einem "extrem korrupten Zustand" (so Schäfer) befindet. Dagegen weisen die Handschriften biblischer Texte selb-

st für die "nichtoffizielle" LXX-Fassung von Dan 4–6 einen völlig anderen Befund auf, wie die nur wenigen echten Varianten zwischen dem Papyrus 967 aus dem 3. Jh. und der mittelalterlichen Minuskel 88 zeigen. Wohl bilden die beiden in MT und LXX überlieferten Versionen von Dan 4–6 wahrscheinlich nur eine kleine Auswahl aus den Versionen von Danielerzählungen, die im 3. und 2. Jh. v. Chr. umliefen (vgl. die Variante, welche die LXX zu Dan 5 noch voranstellt), aber die beiden gewannen schnell Autorität in verschiedenen jüdischen Gruppen und standen dann textlich fest. Für die aramäisch/hebräische Fassung hat dies Henze selber nachgewiesen, indem er aufzeigt, welche Autorität schon die Qumrangemeinde diesem Danielbuch beimaß (229–240). Daß auch der griechischen Erzählsammlung Dan 4–6* hohe Dignität unter den alexandrinischen Juden zukam, beweist der Umstand, daß der LXX-Übersetzer nicht auf sie verzichten wollte und sie kaum veränderte. So vernebelt der Vergleich mit der Hekhalot-Literatur mehr als er klärt.

Da der Vf. die beiden Erzählversionen von Dan 4 einfach nebeneinanderstellt, trägt er zur gegenwärtigen Kontroverse der Danielforschung, ob der aramäischen oder der griechischen Version die Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Priorität zukomme, leider nichts Wesentliches bei. Er beteuert zwar, seine 'synoptische' Sicht sei nicht als Kompromiß oder als Argument gegen eine diachrone Textbetrachtung gemeint (203–204), doch faktisch weicht er der Entscheidung aus und zeigt sich auch sonst an einer historischen, lokalen und gesellschaftlichen Situierung der Texte nicht interessiert.

Auch sonst zeigt der biblische Teil einige Schwächen: Von seiner Themenstellung her behandelt der Vf. Dan 4 als Einzelerzählung, obgleich er sieht, daß sie sowohl im aramäischen (Dan 2–7) als auch im griechischen Text (Dan 4–6) in einen größeren Kontext eingebunden ist. Methodisch sauber hätte er seine Hauptfragestellung nach dem Verhältnis der Versionen zueinander von diesen größeren Kontexten her klären müssen. Für die Rekonstruktion des Septuaginta-Textes greift er auf die Ausgabe von J. Ziegler zurück, obgleich ihm bewußt ist, dass dieser nur einen geringen Teil des Papyrus 967 berücksichtigen konnte. Merkwürdigerweise werden die seither erschienenen Editionen der fehlenden Teile durch W. Hamm (1969, 1977; letztere enthält den Text zu Dan 4!) und A. Geissen (1968) vom Vf. nicht herangezogen. Das ist um so bedauerlicher, weil dieser bislang einzige bekannte alte Septuaginta-Textzeuge einige wichtige Lesarten enthält, welche die griechische Version noch klarer von der aramäischen absetzen. Schließlich vermißt der Leser eine detaillierte Einzelexegese der beiden Versionen, die nötig gewesen wäre, um den folgenden Vergleich auf eine methodisch gesicherte Grundlage zu stellen. So kommt deren unterschiedliche Tendenz nicht klar heraus (s.u.).

Im zweiten Kapitel sucht der Vf. die Bedeutung, die Nabonids Aufenthalt in Tema und seiner Verunglimpfung durch die Mardukpriester für das Motiv von der "Verrücktheit" Nebukadnezars in der Forschung gegeben wird, zu relativieren. Die Beziehungen zwischen den Nabonid-Inschriften, dem Gebet Nabonids aus Qumran (4QOrNab) und Dan 4 seien eher weitläufig, keineswegs literarischer Art, sondern reflektierten auf unterschiedliche Weise dasselbe Ereignis. Größere Bedeutung komme dagegen der mythologischen

babylonischen Tradition zu. So deutet Henze die Verwandlung Nebukadnezars zum Tier als ironische Verkehrung der sumerisch-babylonischen Tradition von der Erschaffung des Wildmenschen, der erst noch zum zivilisierten Menschen verwandelt werden müsse (Enkidu im Gilgamesch-Epos u.a.; 93-99). Dies kann man so sehen. Dagegen führen längere Erwägungen, ob das seltsame Motiv von der "ehernen und eisernen Fessel" um den Baumstumpf (Dan 4,12) etwas mit bronzenen Baumringen, die vielleicht beim neubabylonischen Neujahrsfest eine Rolle gespielt haben (83-90), zu tun haben, zu keinem eindeutigen Ergebnis. So führt der Vf. in diesem Kapitel recht schön sowohl die Möglichkeiten als auch die Grenzen der Motivgeschichte vor.

Nebenbei macht Henze noch eine kleine Beobachtung, die entgegen seiner Meinung, daß die Erzählungen Dan 1-6 einen eigenen Teil gegenüber den Visionen (Dan 7-12) darstellen (10), die literarische Zusammengehörigkeit der aramäischen Kapitel stützt: "It may not be accidental, however, that the clearest case for Babylonian influence can be made with respect to the Aramaic part of the book, including Dan 7" (206). Er verweist mit Recht auf die Rolle des Aramäischen als internationale Verkehrssprache.

Die Hauptthese zur jüdischen und christlichen Auslegungsgeschichte von Dan 4 ist oben schon referiert worden. Sie im einzelnen beurteilen zu wollen, fehlt mir, so gestehe ich offen, die Kompetenz. Am stärksten beeindruckt hat mich der Abschnitt über die syrischen Kirchenväter; er wurde auch vom Vf. in dem von J.J. Collins und P.W. Flint herausgegebenen Sammelband *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (VTS 83/1.2; Leiden 2001) II, 550-571, in leicht veränderter Form noch einmal publiziert.

Abschließend möchte ich nur noch auf ein hermeneutisches Problem dieser so stark auslegungsgeschichtlich orientierten Arbeit aufmerksam machen: Indem der Vf. von der rabbinischen Auslegung her den Aspekt des göttlichen Gerichtes über die Hybris des babylonischen Königs, und von der christlichen Auslegung her den Aspekt der Buße und Begnadigung Nebukadnezars typologisch klar herausgearbeitet hat und mit Dan 4 in eine möglichst enge Beziehung zu setzen sucht, suggeriert er sich und seinen Lesern, es ginge in den beiden Erzählversionen wirklich entscheidend um diese beiden Themen (209-210). Doch ist dies so nicht der Fall! Zielpunkt der aramäischen Erzählung ist nicht das Gericht, sondern die Königsherrschaft Gottes, die sich gegen den babylonischen Weltherrscher durchsetzt (vgl. Dan 3,31-33; 4,31-34); und der Zielpunkt der griechischen Erzählung ist nicht die Buße, sondern die Bekehrung des heidnischen Weltherrschers (Dan 4,37A.B). D. h. so faszinierend es sein mag, die Bibel und ihre Auslegung unter den gemeinsamen Horizont eines "interpretative process" zusammenzubinden, es ist um der genauen Wahrnehmung der biblischen Texte willen wohl doch nötig, beides klar auseinanderzuhalten! Luthers Unterscheidung von Schrift und Tradition hat auch exegetisch durchaus ihren Sinn.

Vielleicht hat sich der Vf. fürs erste etwas zu viel vorgenommen. Aber immerhin, ein vielversprechender Start.

Universitätsstraße 13-17
Alttestamentliches Seminar
D-48143 Münster

Rainer ALBERTZ

Novum Testamentum

Jacob Chacko NALUPARAYIL, *The Identity of Jesus in Mark*. An Essay on Narrative Christology (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 49). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 2000. xviii-636 p. 17 × 24

This substantial work derives from the author's 1999 Ph.D. dissertation at the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum in Jerusalem. This *Sitz im Leben* is internally suggested in Naluparayil's thorough familiarity with the scholarly literature in several languages and his meticulous attention to the details of scholarly debates. Extensive footnotes and a 67-page bibliography make a generous contribution to those who will labor in the field Naluparayil has plowed. An Index of Authors and an Index of Main [Q] Logia and Pericopae Discussed are also supplied. One small peculiarity of the book that readers will notice is some struggling with the English language, serving not so much to diminish the work's overall clarity but more to increase awareness of how strange a language English really is.

The work is very systematically laid out — from its detailed table of contents to the overviews, outlines, and summaries presented for sections and sub-sections. In a work of this size and complexity, these strategies are, of course, helpful, although they become rather formulaic and predictable by the end. The book is divided into two major parts: 'Preliminary Investigations' and 'Jesus in the Markan Narrative'. Since part one is 287 pages long, one might question the term 'preliminary'! The first chapter of part one does discuss the 'Present State of Research and Methodology', which would be expected as preliminary in this genre. In the first part of this chapter Naluparayil's review of the problem of the identity of Jesus in Mark — from the messianic secret, θεῖος ἀνὴρ Christology, and corrective Christology; to Son of God, Son of Man, and polar Christologies; to Jesus as teacher/prophet and integrative Christology — serves well to prepare the reader for Naluparayil's own contribution to narrative Christology, as promised by the book's subtitle. However, there is a detour — a detour much longer than that of the Markan Jesus and his disciples on the way to Bethsaida (6,45–8,22) — a detour to discuss issues of sources and redaction. Certainly source criticism and redaction criticism were preliminary to narrative criticism in the development of the scholarly investigation of the Gospels, but, having been prepared for a narrative Christology of Mark by Naluparayil's critique of theories of Markan sources and the conflicting results of redaction critical studies, I was taken by surprise by his extensive examination of Mark and the pre-Markan tradition (PMT). Chapter 2 discusses Q and Mark, and chap. 3 investigates Mark and pre-Markan collections (PMCs), both with the goal of comparing the treatment of the identity of Jesus in the PMT and in Mark.

Numerous source and redaction critical issues are debated along the way. Naluparayil discusses the debate on the relation between Q (*Quelle*) and

Mark; however, he nowhere discusses the debate about the 'existence' of Q itself. As a Q skeptic, I found it difficult to become fully engaged with his discussion of the possible 'overlap passages' of Mark and Q, a hypothetical document originally proposed to explain the overlap passages of Matthew and Luke exclusive of Mark! Naluparayil analyzes a dozen Mk/Q overlap passages that contain the theme of Jesus' identity. Similarly Naluparayil discusses the debates about the extent of the PMCs, settling on seven he considers have the support of the majority of commentators for his examination of Christological tendencies in comparison with Mark: the day in Capernaum (1,21a + 29-38, without 34cd), Galilean conflict stories (2,15-28), parables (4,3-9, 10* [with the * indicating 'the supposed redactional interpolations'], 13*-20, 26-29, 30-32, 33), miracle stories (4,35*-39, 41; 5,1-20, 21*-37*, 38-40*, 41-42, 43c), catechetical instructions (10,2-12, 17*-27), an apocalyptic discourse (13,5a?, 7-8, 14-20, 24-27), and a passion narrative (14,1-2, 10-11, 17-72; 15,1-16,8, without 15,39).

Naluparayil's conclusions about Mark and Q and Mark and the PMCs parallel each other, and his conclusions about Mark and the PMT (Q + PMCs) foreshadow the conclusions to each of his subsequent chapters, whatever their approach or subject matter, thus I cite them rather fully here: '(1) Mark shares in the PMT's common heritage of employing the designation "the Son of Man" as the name of the divine person present in Jesus of Nazareth, by sustaining its distinctive feature as the unique and exclusive self-designation of Jesus (285)'. '(2) Qualifying use of all other Christological titles in relation to the divine name "the Son of Man" has been the second predominant trend present in the PMT in general. Mk appears to elaborate this pre-Markan Christological speciality by developing the two titles "the Christ" and "the Son of God" as the confessional Christological titles' (286). '(3) Mk uses one sphere of the Son of Man's life-history, viz., his destiny of death-resurrection which is his earthly mission, in order to give contents [*sic*] to the confessional Christological titles of Christhood and divine Sonship' (286). With these 'Preliminary Investigations' behind us, we move on to a consideration of the 'Jesus of the Markan Narrative'.

Naluparayil's narrative critical investigation has three focal points: the plot of Mark and Jesus (chap. 4), points of view and Jesus (chap. 5), and the character of Jesus, the protagonist of Mark (chap. 6). Each of these chapters opens with a discussion of the relevant theoretical debate and moves to an application of this theory to the Markan narrative. Concerning plot, Naluparayil appropriately begins with S. Chatman's *Story and Discourse* but continues the dialogue with scholars familiar in the field of narrative criticism of the Gospels: R. Fowler, W. Kelber, F. Kermodé, E. Struthers Malbon, St. Moore, N. Petersen, M.A. Powell, D. Rhoads, R. Tannehill, M.A. Tolbert, et al. Concerning point of view, Naluparayil relies primarily on Chatman and B. Uspensky, continuing the scholarly conversation with J. Dewey, Fowler, J.D. Kingsbury, St. Smith, Petersen, Rhoads, Tannehill, et al. Concerning the theory of character, Naluparayil again begins with the foundational work of Chatman and moves out to include W. Booth, E. Broadhead, J. Camery-Hoggatt, A. Culpepper, U. Luz, Scholes and Kellogg, D. Via, J. Williams, et al. I was surprised to find no reference to J. Darr's *On Character Building* (which, although focused on Luke-Acts, offers a strong theoretical

introduction) — but only because Naluparayil's familiarity with the scholarly literature is so impressive.

In discussing the sequential development of the plot as it sheds light on the 'identity' of Jesus, Naluparayil relies on a working hypothesis of the plot structure based mainly on the Markan structure proposed by P. Danove, and consisting of the following narrative blocks (of rather unequal length): 1,1; 1,2-13; 1,14-8,26; 8,27-10,52; 11,1-15,41; 15,42-16,8. Naluparayil's quite detailed (140-page) discussion of the Markan plot, as it answers the question Who is Jesus?, comes to two very basic conclusions: 'The plot of Mark's narrative is the good news of Jesus Christ, Son of God' (428). 'The plot is structured with the prospect of transforming the reader into an ideal disciple and the messenger of the good news' (429). However, it is in the depiction of the implied reader at the end of the narrative where Naluparayil's interpretation, his own narrative Christology, is most clearly presented in a compressed form: 'When the [implied] reader reaches the end of the narrative, he [Naluparayil always refers to the implied reader as "he"] has been informed and he is being formed into the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth is the heavenly Son of Man on earth; that the Son of Man is the Christ-Son of God; that he fulfils the promised mission of the eschatological Lord in realizing the eschatological salvation of men; that he achieves it by undergoing his destiny of suffering, death, and resurrection, which was designed by God, his Father; that the Son of Man's destiny constitutes the core of the good news; that one can become an insider/disciple by following the "way" of the Son of Man; that only by following him in his way of suffering and death, one can really comprehend, assimilate, and proclaim the good news of Jesus the Son of Man who is the Christ-the-Son of God; and that "the Son of Man's way" of dying for others is "the path" to the divine filiation and to the βασιλεία of God' (429-430).

Next Naluparayil examines the points of view of what he terms five 'individuals' — the narrator, God, Jesus, the disciples, and the Jewish leaders — on two 'planes': the identity plane (their point of view about Jesus) and the ideological plane (their evaluative viewpoint). The point of view of Jesus is in conflict with the point of view of the Jewish leaders on the one hand and the disciples on the other; however, 'there is a gradual progress in the point of view of the disciples regarding the identity of Jesus on account of consistent efforts by Jesus' (507-508). The points of view of God, Jesus, the narrator, and the implied reader converge. Naluparayil's conclusion echoes that of Norman Petersen in 1978: 'The correct point of view of the narrative is designated as "thinking the things of God", which is epitomized in the person of Jesus the Son of Man' (515). 'The wrong point of view is entitled as "thinking the things of men", which is represented by the Jewish leaders and the disciples, but in incomparable proportions' (516).

Finally, Naluparayil investigates the character Jesus directly by identifying separately the traits of Jesus from the views of other characters and the traits of Jesus from what he does and says. Then Naluparayil 'brings together' these two lists of traits, along with 'other evidences appearing in the narrative that would assist our comprehension of Jesus' character traits' (540; a less than clear method), into a list of 'prominent traits' and the 'designation' that 'answer the question "what Jesus is like"' (540): a human person; a

superior dignitary in disguise; divine Sonship, Christhood, and the destiny of death and resurrection; loyalty and obedience of the divine Son; teacher with ἐξουσία and δυνάμεις, and the possessor of the Holy Spirit; divine wisdom (σοφία); divine ἐξουσία and σοφία operating as the liberating mercy; savior; establisher of the reign of God on earth. In his final paragraph before his triple conclusion (to chap. 6, to part 2, to the book), Naluparayil asks his final (and initial) question and gives his final (and initial) answer: Given 'the insufficiency of the protagonist's name [Jesus of Nazareth] to carry the divine character traits', 'does the narrator provide us with another narrative noun or designation which can function as the receptacle of all the supernatural traits of Jesus? Yes, 'the Son of Man' functions in the narrative as the designation, as the locus of all the above-said divine character traits of the protagonist, as the name of the divine person' (547).

Naluparayil comments on the title of Mark's Gospel, '1:1 provides the reader with the content of 1:2–16:8; what is narrated in 1:2–16:8 is articulated in summary form in 1:1' (303). Perhaps this is the case with Naluparayil's book title, *The Identity of Jesus in Mark*, as well. His quest for Jesus' identity is quite abstract and theological. It also seems to me that his understanding of Jesus' identity is anachronistic and reified. His use of the term 'divine person' seems more Chalcedonian than Markan. Jesus' identity seems abstracted from the telling of a story and reified as a collection of Christological propositions. I find the book's subtitle, *An Essay on Narrative Christology*, subordinate indeed. At 600+ pages, it is hardly an essay, and narrative Christology not only is not its sole content, but the Christology overwhelms the narrative. In his understanding of Markan Christology, Jack Dean Kingsbury privileges the titles of Jesus privileged by the narrator in 1,1 — Christ and Son of God. In contrast, Naluparayil privileges the title or designation privileged by Jesus — Son of Man. However, since Naluparayil interprets all other titles and designations as 'qualifying' the 'Son of Man', his resulting narrative Christology is an amalgam that dissolves the Markan implied author's tension between what the narrator says and what Jesus says instead.

It is true that you cannot tell a book by its cover. The splendidly beautiful cover of this book, designed by S. De Luca, a friend and colleague of Naluparayil, captures the tension I sense in Mark's narrative Christology but not in Naluparayil's depiction of it. One side of the portrait of Jesus resembles an icon, with a golden halo and a penetrating gaze. The other side of the portrait is dark and ghost-like, with an intriguing raised eyebrow. The two sides of Jesus' face are not mirror images of each other, nor does one simply qualify the other, not are they integrated or synthesized. They exist in a creative, eternally present tension — and invite the viewer to enter in. At least that's what I see in the image and read in Mark's Gospel.

Early in his text, Naluparayil asks, 'Why do the scholars, with all their serious-mindedness and acute eye to the minute details, arrive at conflicting conclusions?' (3). He conceives of two fundamental factors: '(1) dissimilar use of the text by its separation between the traditional sources and the redactional elements; (2) defect of the tools, viz., that of the methodologies being applied for the purpose' (page 3). I can easily imagine two more: (1) ambiguities within the narrative text and (2) diverse perspectives within the

audience — from the original hearers to scholarly commentators. Both factors are often remarked upon by narrative critics, as well as by reader response critics. Hopefully both will play a larger role in Naluparayil's forthcoming book (see 556), *A Reader-Response Christology of Mark*.

Virginia Polytechnic
Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-0135 (USA)

Elizabeth STRUTHERS MALBON

Jay HARRINGTON, *The Lukan Passion Narrative*. The Markan Material in Luke 22,54–23,25 (NT Tools and Studies 30). Leiden, Brill, 2000. xiii-1003 p. 16 × 24,5

This book is based upon a doctoral dissertation successfully defended at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven in June, 1998; the dissertation was directed by Prof. F. Neirynck. A description of the book's contents can be expressed best by including Harrington's own words, together with some observations (in italics).

For over a century there has been a debate among scholars regarding the source(s) of Luke's Passion narrative, but Harrington contends:

...no adequate history has sketched the contours of the debate. Our goal is not only to present a recent history (*through 1997*), but to trace the discussion to its beginnings (*for all practical purposes: Paul Feine, 1891 and Johannes Weiss, 1892*). We have generally followed a combination of a chronological and systematic order alternating between proponents and opponents of the theory of a special source or sources. It has also been our intention to report dependence of scholars upon one another ... In the treatment of each scholar's position, insofar as it is possible, we review their underlying Synoptic theory, their source theory as applied to the passion in general, then the trial of Pilate, and finally any contributions regarding the trial before Herod. (*At the end of the book*) three appendices are provided: (1) Special LQ vocabulary and constructions according to J. Weiss (LQ is a combination, found by Weiss, of L, Q and Markan sections, which combination Luke eventually used in the final edition of his work), (2) Lukan priority theories, and (3) the Gospel of Peter and its relation to the Herod pericope. More specifically, we propose to examine the Markan material in a particular section of the Lukan passion narrative: the trials in Luke 22,54–23,25 ... The final section of the dissertation is devoted to my interpretation of Luke 23,6-16 (xii).

To the history of discussion about the sources of Luke and his Passion Narrative Harrington devotes 11 chapters. The chapter headings give a good indication of his manner of proceeding: 'The First Proponents of a Special Proto-Lukan Source' (Feine – Easton); 'In Defense of Markan Priority'

(Holtzmann – Bultmann); ‘The Golden Age of Special Source Theories’ (Schlatter – Price); ‘Critique of Proto-Luke’ (Creed – Gilmour); ‘A Special Proto-Lukan Source Revisited’ (Meyer – Ellis); ‘Lukan Redaction of Mark’ (Vaganay – Dauer); ‘Interest Rekindled in a Special Source’ (Schneider – Catchpole); ‘The Lukan Passion as a Redaction of Mark’ (Page – van der Kwaak); ‘Special Sources and the Special Material’ (Marshall – Bock); ‘Contemporary Redaction Critics’ Dispensing with a Special Source’ (Brown – Stein); ‘The Rise of a New Literary Criticism’ (Marin – Doble).

As regards particulars of the book, some observations are in order. One can expect in this lengthy history a certain oscillation between a general source theory for Luke and a particular source investigation for Luke passion narrative, especially for Luke 22,54–23,25. The choice for such a variation does offer a helpful variety to the account.

Granted that no criticism will diminish the achievement Harrington presents to the scholarly world, one does have the sense that, despite so many hundreds of pages (and with notably small print), his still will be a book used not without some effort. For instance, if one were to look up references to B.H. Streeter in the history of source questions, one would find a continuous section of pages (181–195), which is very well done, but then, to be thorough, one must look up well over 140 other references in the book to the same man. But then would there be any other easier way to achieve what Harrington has achieved here?

Harrington puts a great deal of effort into demonstrating Luke’s dependence on Mark. But it is hard to fit together the picture of a Luke who has in the last 50 years earned the reputation of being an excellent writer and who, in this case of Jesus before Herod, creates his story, with a Luke who laboriously takes from here and there often small bits of vocabulary and style. Perhaps to make reasonable a theory of such dependence, we must be able to describe more satisfactorily than heretofore how a person of talent goes about constructing his story so as to leave behind telltale bits from sources. Some examples of a constrained dependency on Mark are in order.

Harrington notes in regard to *ὄντα* (Luke 23,7) that ‘Mark contained a form of *ὄν* two sentences referring to location. Both are genitive absolutes (cf. Mark 14,3.66)’ (730). What are we to understand by this Markan notice? Apparently that there is some literary relationship between Mark and Luke on the use of this participle with location, which made Luke use this participle at this point in his text? Is this a conscious dependence on Mark?

Harrington notes that ‘also in Mark 6,20, Herod was portrayed as *πολλὰ ἡπόρει* while in 9,7 Herod *διηπόρει*’ (735). *Διαπορέω* occurs only here in Luke in addition to three times in Acts ... Thus it is Lukan vocabulary’. If there is dependence on Mark for the choice of this verb, why conclude that ‘it is Lukan vocabulary’? Do not these references cast doubt that this verb is ‘Lukan vocabulary’? Or is there really no dependence on Mark?

Perhaps Harrington is correct, that Luke does depend on Mark in the Herod story, but the picture he suggests of how Luke worked is difficult to accept.

Lukan relationship to earlier Greek is also mentioned, but to what end? In a paragraph (724–725), where Harrington strongly indicates that the particle *εἰ* (to introduce an indirect question) is semitic usage in Biblical Greek, it is

hard to understand why he begins his discussion by noting that *ἐἰ* is used frequently in classical Greek.

Apart from what I think are difficult relationships drawn between the Markan text and the Lukan text, I would point up two examples where attention should be given to particles in exegesis.

The author offers no meaning of the subordination, indicated by *γάρ*, of the *γάρ*-clause to what precedes (739), and so the relationship of the verbs of this clause with the main verb of the sentence is obscured. But with this relationship obscured, one can well lose track of the logic within the story.

There is no explanation of the force of *δέ* which opens v. 9 (746), but an explanation would serve exegesis well. In other words, what import does this particle carry in the thinking of the author who thought it should be there?

Harrington's manuscript was accepted and published in the series 'New Testament Tools and Studies'. The manuscript seems to this reviewer to be much stronger in Tools than in Studies. The immense and expert history of the source(s) of the Lukan passion narrative, together with the appendices at the end of the manuscript, is a remarkable accomplishment, a dense repository of historical knowledge to the benefit of all. It has the advantage of excellent judgment in every phase leading to presentation. On the other hand, the exegesis of Luke 23,6-16 is reasonable, but is, if I may suggest, hampered by a continuous mixing of source questions with interpretation of the text as it stands — with the dominant interest in answering the source questions. Of the 10 points (802-803) which Harrington identifies as 'the result of our exegesis of Luke 23,6-16', only one of them states the purpose of the pericope as it stands in the Gospel (it argues Jesus' innocence), but the other 9 all address questions of source.

A word can be inserted here about Harrington's interpretation of Luke 23,6-16. Certainly, Harrington, like so many before him, is correct to state that Luke wants the reader to understand that Jesus, as far as Herod was concerned, was innocent. But certain other elements seem also part of Luke's intention in this passage. So often in the rest of the Gospel, positive and negative reaction to the divine is very important to Luke, and a very important form of instilling *ἀσφάλεια* in his reader; the Herodian reaction of mistreatment and abuse and ridicule serves to underline what the reader knows to be the correct significance of Jesus and, for the believer, the horror of his rejection. Indeed, if Harrington is correct that the garment in which Herod clothes Jesus symbolizes (for Luke) divinity, the ridicule from these gentiles serves to support the reader's belief regarding the truth about Jesus and the reverence truly owed him. Through the use of this garment, Jesus is shown to be more than a prophet, though Harrington (795) will contend that this is the title which best fits Jesus in this story. Moreover, though Harrington does argue that prophecy is being fulfilled in this story before Herod, he does not give ample credit to Luke 18,32. Here, clearly the gentiles are inserted as major players in the fate of Jesus. Looking at this verse, it is difficult to agree with Harrington that 'while the Markan Jesus indicated that he would be handed over to the Gentiles who will mistreat him, Luke separated this and by using the passive did not necessarily implicate the Gentiles in the mockery. This allowed others, namely the Jews, to be understood as mistreating Jesus'

(755). Whatever guilt may be laid at the feet of the Jewish leaders, 18,32 speaks only about gentiles, and gives them a most significant place in what will follow; the Herod episode corresponds to what was, at least once, predicted.

One can argue that the history Harrington so admirably presents shows why recent scholarship has been discontent with source study as key to understanding Luke; thus, many have taken up other kinds of criticism. Harrington's own exegesis of Luke 23,6-16 would be even better, if he would intensely apply some other approaches to the biblical text than one dominated by the source question. But I do not think anyone will fault the clear and thorough presentation of the source-question in regard to, and especially in regard to the Lukan Passion account; for this immense and successful contribution we can all be grateful.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
I-00187 Rome

John J. KILGALLAN, SJ

Tom THATCHER, *The Riddles of Jesus in John. A Study in Tradition and Folklore* (SBLMS 53). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. x-306 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$ 45.00

La ricerca ha per oggetto «I detti enigmatici (DE) di Gesù in Giovanni». Ai DE giovannei aveva già dedicato uno studio H. Leroy (*Rätsel und Missverständnis. Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums* [BBB 30; Bonn 1968]), che, usando il metodo morfologico e fermandosi ai singoli detti (e. g. Gv 2,19-22; 3,3-5), secondo il nostro a., ne perdeva la strutturazione dialogica orale, non teneva conto delle forme popolari e per di più si fondava su uno studio del DE ormai superato (44, n. 3).

Il lavoro non è strutturato nel modo usuale; vi mancano introduzione (rimpiazzata dal primo capitolo) e conclusione. Degli otto capitoli di cui si compone, quattro sono dedicati alla problematica previa: quella giovannea (1° e 2°) e quella teoretica (3° e 4°). Tale ampia ricognizione problematica comprende due terzi dell'opera (1-182) e un terzo allo studio dei 38 DE, di cui 35 di Gesù (189-294). Vi prevale quindi l'interesse metodologico. Data l'estrema analiticità del lavoro, concentro la mia valutazione critica su tre punti, che seguono i tre argomenti successivamente trattati: (I) la ricerca nel quadro degli studi giovannei; (II) la fondazione metodologica e teoretica; (III) l'apporto allo studio del Quarto Vangelo (QV).

I. Il punto di partenza è l'importanza della tradizione orale nella trasmissione dei discorsi di Gesù nel QV. Gli studiosi della *Formgeschichte* (Fg) presupponevano «that the speeches of the FG do not contain a substantial amount of Jesus tradition. It has therefore been deemed unnecessary to explore the possibility that portions of Gospel's discourses might be patterned after oral genres as the riddle» (1). La tesi sembra voler superare il fossato che separa la predicazione della chiesa dal Gesù storico, retaggio della Fg, ma rimane invece a livello di «forma orale» dei di-

scorsi, senza alcuna riflessione critica che conduca alla possibile storicità gesuana dei DE sia per l'ambiente palestinese che riflettono sia per la diversità col mondo giudaico, in cui peraltro vanno collocati. Contro ogni illusione, l'a. lo esclude esplicitamente alla fine del capitolo: «Sayings units in FG may be 'traditional' in the broad sense that they are based on common oral speech patterns even if FE composed them whole cloth. As such, the present study will not immediately be concerned with whether or not Jesus himself used the riddles in the present text of FG, nor will it speculate on the origin of these units» (41). Il problema storico viene perciò emarginato fino ad ammettere che i DE potrebbero essere stati composti di sana pianta dal Quarto Evangelista (QE). La ricerca si pone, dunque, sul piano *letterario e formale*. L'a. disegna la storia della ricerca in quattro stadi successivi: da B.W. Bacon (1910) fino a F. Neirynck (1990 ss): nella prima, fonte dei discorsi sono considerati i Sinottici; nella seconda (P.C. Smith del 1938) la tradizione giovannea è ritenuta autonoma; la terza è caratterizzata dall'influsso di R. Bultmann con la sua nota teoria delle fonti diverse; la quarta, di F. Neirynck (1990 ss), ritorna alla dipendenza dai Sinottici. In conclusione egli sostiene che i discorsi del QV non vanno considerati quali «oggetti» da studiare nella loro forma letteraria scritta (Dibelius e Bultmann), ma come «eventi linguistici» che presuppongono una *situazione dialogica*. Su tre punti questo metodo si distingue dalla Fg: l'accento posto sulla *funzione sociale* del discorso (e del linguaggio), la *caratterizzazione orale* che implica il dialogo fra due persone e lo studio della tradizione popolare (il folklore). Il discorso orale, nelle tradizioni tramandate a memoria, varia a seconda di chi lo trasmette e dell'uditorio che ha davanti. L'identificazione delle forme tradizionali non dipende solo dallo studio dei documenti paralleli, come nella Fg; l'a. la vuole integrare col metodo linguistico delle tradizioni orali (77). Il limite critico è come e quanto si possano applicare ad un testo antico metodi usati per fenomeni attuali di tradizione orale.

II. Dalla critica letteraria delle fonti senza esito (39) nei capitoli seguenti (79-182) si passa alla *fondazione teorica del nuovo metodo*, in cui sono meno competente. Per descrivere la natura delle forme orali l'a. ricorre ai teorici (R. Jakobson, M.N. Bachtin, L. Bitzer, T. Todorov) e perviene a questa definizione: la forma orale è «quella serie di parametri che governa l'interazione verbale tra uno che fa un discorso e un uditorio in una situazione retorica, "there are thus genres of situations, not of oral texts» (102). La si potrebbe chiamare, dunque, «situational theory» per distinguerla dalla Fg. Ispirandosi all'opera di N.R. Petersen (107, n. 79) e alla sua categoria di «antilinguaggio», Thatcher sostiene che il linguaggio giovanneo è nato come antilinguaggio in una situazione dialogica di conflitto col gruppo messianico di origine. Si ipotizzano perciò due situazioni retoriche: quella messianica di origine, presente nel «racconto» e quella conflittuale della retorica giovannea che riflette i problemi di una comunità cristiana in conflitto con la sinagoga. Quanto al metodo morfologico, rinnovato per studiare le forme orali, si delineano tre momenti successivi: (a) i contesti (situazione concreta, ideologica) in cui si sviluppano i discorsi giovannei; (b) le forme tipiche che vi appaiono; (c) l'analisi del DE di superficie in concreto (109). Tale metodo è adatto a quei discorsi del QV,

che non hanno paralleli letterari e sono prodotti da un gruppo subculturale che usa un antilinguaggio rispetto al gruppo culturale originario. Dentro al genere del discorso *il DE rappresenta una specie* (capo 4°). Si percorre la storia della ricerca a partire da A. Taylor (1939) fino alle proposte più recenti. Ciò che interessa il QV è lo studio dei DE come «testi scritti» (167-178). Non sempre i DE sono guidati da una logica normale; talora infatti potrebbero essere considerati arbitrari; la loro autorevolezza deriva comunque da colui che li pronuncia, Gesù stesso. Due elementi essenziali configurano un testo enigmatico: (a) sono pronunciati in una riunione di persone, che discutono (riddling session); (b) va distinta la situazione del *mondo reale*, cui viene narrata la discussione enigmica (i destinatari del QV) da quella del *mondo del racconto* (orale), in cui vi è uno che narra, uno che pronuncia un DE e un altro (persona o gruppo) cui il DE è rivolto, che rimane normalmente confuso; mentre i destinatari del QV hanno già nel testo scritto lo svelamento dell'enigma. Nell'esegesi tradizionale si parla di due piani storici: quello palestinese della predicazione cristiana in prospettiva messianica e quello ellenistico della comunità giovannea cui è rivolto il QV. Il problema che si pone l'a. è però letterario; i due piani sono due «situazioni retoriche» diverse. In conclusione il DE come testo viene definito: «*a concise, interrogative unit of language that intentionally and at once conceals and reveals its referent with a single set of signs*» (179 [corsivo suo]). Il nascondere e il rivelare presuppone due gruppi di persone: quello interno al linguaggio enigmatico, che potrebbe capire, e quello esterno al gruppo per il quale l'enigma rimane oscuro (180). In questa prospettiva, socio religiosa, il linguaggio enigmatico diviene criterio di identità del gruppo, in quanto solo chi vi appartiene riesce a capire quel linguaggio. Alla fine, quattro criteri vengono stabiliti per identificare un DE: (a) il narratore dice al suo uditorio che il detto è intenzionalmente ambiguo (Gv 2,16.19.21-22); (b) chi parla può segnalare che le sue parole sono intenzionalmente ambigue (e. g. Gv 3,3.5; 4,7); (c) chi ascolta il DE, nel racconto, vi risponde confuso, facendo capire che il DE può avere più di un referente (e. g. Gv 3,3.5; 4,32; 6,51); (d) la persona che pronuncia un DE usa un vocabolario che sembra contraddire la logica (e. g. Gv 4,20; 7,23; 10,34-36; 11,25-26). Per catalogare un detto giovanneo fra i DE occorre sia presente almeno uno di questi quattro criteri (181-182).

III. Passando al QV e assumendo per validi i quattro criteri, ne deriva una tavola di 38 DE (184-187), più del doppio di quelli studiati da Leroy. Questo risultato, in cui una rete più ampia ha raccolto un numero più elevato di DE, mi sembra più plausibile perché corrisponde allo stile unitario proprio del QV. I DE sono sempre inclusi in dialoghi e discussioni fra Gesù e i suoi interlocutori, che non riconoscono la sua identità. In 35 dei 38 DE è Gesù che parla. La forma orale del DE si inserisce in un dialogo enigmatico, il cui modello è il seguente: «(a) Jesus poses a riddle; (b) the riddlee or the narrator indicates confusion; (c) Jesus provides his own, often elaborate answer; (d) the answer may introduce another riddle; (e) the new riddle again confuses the riddlee; (f) Jesus provides an answer to the new riddle» (188). Il testo più vicino è Gv 6,32-64. La sua pervasiva presenza nel QV «suggests that the narrative pattern was a key structural element in the Johannine oral archive» (188). Ma chi stava all'origine del-

le tradizioni orali conservate nell'archivio giovanneo? È spontaneo pensare a Gesù stesso, anche se i suoi DE secondo lo stesso evangelista (Gv 2,20-21; 12,16) furono compresi solo dopo la risurrezione col ricorso alle Scritture e la mediazione dello Spirito. Se si vuole far credito all'evangelista nella fede, bisognerebbe pensare che i DE risalgano originariamente a Gesù, mentre la loro comprensione e rielaborazione, divenuta testo, è dovuta alla mediazione dell'evangelista, in relazione ai suoi attuali destinatari verso la fine del I.

Il Thatcher, in base all'analisi dei DE contesta la lettura storico-critica del QV che spiega la aporie e le incomprensioni interne ai dialoghi enigmatici in termini di sviluppo successivo (c. g. Painter, Brown, Segovia). I problemi sollevati scompaiono in una lettura sincronica del testo alla luce del modello enigmatico. Quanto viene giudicato «aporia» rientra, non nella nostra logica, ma in quella di una discussione enigmica (196-197). E lo si dimostra nella lettura dei «discorsi di addio» (Gv 13-17), contestando la tesi di F.F. Segovia (*The Farewell of the Word. The Johanne Call to Abide* [Philadelphia 1991]): Gv 13-16 sarebbe un discorso tenuto insieme da una serie di sette DE e di sette risposte ad essi date (Gv 13,10.21.33; 14,4.7.19; 16,16).

I DE del QV vengono catalogati poi in quattro tipi: (a) i sette *enigmi drammatici* evidenziano il profilo dei soggetti (Gv 6,5; 11,11.23; 13,10.21; 21,18.22). (b) i cinque *enigmi di minaccia* mettono in difficoltà chi è interpellato (Gv 4,20; 7,23; 8,4-5; 9,2; 10,34-36); (c) I 17 *enigmi di missione* riguardano la comprensione dell'identità e della missione di Gesù (Gv 2,4b.16.19; 4,32; 8,18.24.26.31-32.38.51.56; 9,39; 10,1-5; 12,32; 13,33 [7,34; 8,21]; 14,4.7); (d) sette gli *enigmi di salvezza* (Gv 3,3-5; 4,7-10; 6,32.51; 7,37-38; 11,25.26; 14,19; 16,16). I tre ultimi capitoli analizzano i quattro tipi di DE, rispondendo a due questioni: «First what makes this saying a 'riddle'? How does the narrative indicate that the language is intentionally ambiguous? Second, what are the exegetical implications of reading this saying as a riddle...» (211). Essendo impossibile recensire l'analisi dei DE, mi limito ad alcune valutazioni sintetiche. Il difetto principale dell'analisi è il suo limitarsi al solo dialogo-enigmatico senza uno sguardo all'unità letteraria più ampia in cui sono inseriti, contro il suo stesso principio della sincronia. Porto tre esempi: Alle nozze di Cana Gesù si rivolge alla madre col termine «donna» (γύναι) (Gv 2,4a). Ora, secondo l'a., non solo sarebbe spregiativo (233, n. 6), ma significherebbe che Maria non è considerata madre di Gesù «for the FE does not think of Mary as Jesus 'mother'. FE's Jesus has no 'mother' having 'come down from heaven' (John 6:33; 16:28)» (233), mentre non si tiene conto che anche sul Calvario Gesù si rivolge a lei con lo stesso appellativo (Gv 19,26), senza alcun carattere negativo; quanto al termine 'madre', delle 11x che ricorre nel QV ben 10 riguardano la madre di Gesù, «la madre» per eccellenza, e non collide con la fede nell'incarnazione del Verbo, Figlio di Dio (cf. G. Segalla, «La 'Madre degli inizi' nel vangelo di Giovanni», *Theotokos* 8 [2000] 769-785). Il secondo esempio è la confessione di Marta in Gv 11,27, di cui l'a. afferma: è vero che include termini chiave della cristologia giovannea «But Martha's answer is only accidentally correct, for she is using this Johannine language in a non Johannine sense» e con-

tinua «...whatever the terms 'Christ' and 'the Son of God' mean for the FE, it is plain throughout this episode that Martha thinks of Jesus primarily as a healer» (277). Ora, i due termini costituiscono la confessione finale di fede che il QE intende far abbracciare ai suoi lettori (Gv 20,30-31); inoltre nel racconto Gesù stesso presuppone la confessione di fede di Martha: «Non ti ho detto che, *se credi*, vedrai la gloria di Dio?» (Gv 11,40). Non sta qui la soluzione dell'enigma di Gv 11,25-26 (cf. anche Gv 11,4)? Quanto alla domanda della samaritana a Gesù: «Come mai tu, essendo giudeo, chiedi da bere a me che sono samaritana?» (Gv 4,9), secondo l'a. essa include una duplice ironia: «First, Jesus is certainly not a 'Jew in the sense that FE uses that term ... Second as 4:32 and 7:37-39 indicate, Jesus does not take water from anyone; rather others come to him to drink» (279). Il primo argomento è fuori luogo, sia perché a livello della storia, la sorpresa proviene proprio dal conflitto fra giudei e samaritani (Gv 9,4b) sia perché nel contesto del dialogo, Gesù stesso afferma «che la salvezza è dai giudei» (Gv 4,22); perciò in primo luogo da lui! Infine, non è convincente la sua allegorizzazione del «mangiare e bere», riferita all'eucaristia, rinviando a testi del cosiddetto «Vangelo di Tommaso: 7.27.108», tutti di carattere gnostico e tardivi (290).

In conclusione, la ricerca che studia i DE di Gesù nel QV sullo sfondo delle forme linguistiche orali porta indubbiamente un contributo in quanto colloca i DE nella loro situazione dialogica. Però, dato il carattere unilaterale della ricerca e la conoscenza limitata della letteratura giovannea, le singole analisi dei testi giovannei richiedono sempre un vaglio critico e il confronto con i risultati conseguiti con i metodi della consolidata tradizione esegetica.

Via Seminario, 29
I- 35122 Padova PD

Giuseppe SEGALLA

Simon LÉGASSE, *Les épîtres de Paul aux Thessaloniens* (Lectio Divina. Commentaires 7). Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1999. 448 p. 13,4 × 21,5. FF 250

Simon Légasse's commentary on 1 and 2 Thessalonians is both rich and enigmatic: rich in its detailed discussions of the most minute details of the text and its wide knowledge of the secondary literature, enigmatic because the forest is sometimes overlooked for the trees. Following a meticulous analysis of complex details — often carried out with exceptional skill — one would have wished for more precise summaries and implications of these for the understanding of particular sections of the letter as well as the letter as a whole. One might best describe Légasse's work as a comprehensive handbook of exceptionally useful information for the student of 1 and 2 Thessalonians. It is, however, less helpful in providing a precise perspective as to why these New Testament letters were written.

With regard to the first characteristic just described, one can, by way of example, point to such particularly valuable discussions pertaining to the meaning of σκευός, πρῶγμα and ἄτακτος. A detailed review of the possible meanings of σκευός leads Légasse to conclude that it should be understood in the 'sens d'«organe génital» masculin...' (218). The relationship of this noun to the verb κτᾶσθαι is also taken up and the translation 'maîtriser' is rejected in favor of 'disposer de', specifically in the sense of inclining oneself toward ἁγιασμός (219). The much discussed term πρῶγμα (223) is linked to the overall context of sexuality which defines this section. And, finally, in this context, one should praise Légasse for his very appropriate interpretation of ἄτακτος in 5,14 as 'sans ordre ni normes, ici ordre et normes émanant de Dieu' (321). Very brief, yet insightful, this translation is far superior to such current English translations as 'idlers' or 'loafers'. One would only have wished for a more thorough discussion of how this Pauline advice relates to the purpose of the entire letter.

Throughout much of this 400+ page volume, Légasse's detailed, specific suggestions are offset by vague generalities with regard to its overall purpose and theology. As one would expect, the largest portion of the commentary is devoted to 1 Thessalonians. But one looks in vain for a comprehensive understanding of why Paul wrote this letter. The introductory section, 'Les besoins d'une communauté', is rather typical of the overall approach. It summarizes what others have said, often with helpful detail, frequently in a dismissive way, but seldom positing positive alternative interpretations. Having dismissed, for example, the interpretations of Schmithals, Harnish, Jewett and Donfried with regard to the purpose of the letter, there is little hint of where Légasse stands on this critical issue in a wide-ranging, inclusive manner. How useful is it for precise exegesis to reject any one of these scholars by merely stating, without further discussion, that, for example, such a scholar 'a tort de faire des persecutions et du martyre pour ainsi dire le Sitz im Leben de notre épître. En plus d'un point le rapport est faussé' (53, n. 4)? What lends to the overall imprecision of this commentary, and thus often a less than compelling alternative to other scholarly interpretations, is the failure to adequately bring to the fore (1) the question of genre, (2) the specific and concrete situation that Paul is addressing in Thessalonica, and (3) the issue of Acts and, specifically, the matter of chronology. Let us turn to these questions.

The question of genre. This theme is given a scant two pages of attention and contains no serious dialogue with either contemporary epistolographic or rhetorical studies dealing with either of these letters. Some discussions concerning the possible genre of 1 Thessalonians are simply dismissed with statements like '...cet étiquetage est assez artificiel' (50). But then one must ask, what is the purpose for Paul's use of language that includes encouragement and exhortation, praise and blame, and what is the relationship between them? While neglecting such a broad conversation, Légasse himself classifies certain parts of the letter without placing such categorizations into their appropriate broader context. The most obvious example is the description of 1 Thess 2,1-12 as an 'apology' in which Paul is refuting actual charges made against him. When Légasse states that 'Paul... savait qu'il était l'objet de calumnies comme le prouve sa défense en 2,3-10'

one needs to know much more precisely who is bringing these charges against Paul and for what reason. But Légasse never appears to clarify this matter and is content with the conclusion 'que Paul entend se distinguer des philosophes ambulants du monde gréco-romain' (137), even though earlier he has criticized Malherbe for positing such a view: 'Notons dès à présent que cette thèse en general n'est pas compatible avec le texte de Paul, son style et ses formules' (109). Although the entire discussion of 2,1-12 is profuse with detail, it is ambiguous not only with regard to the question of genre but also regarding its function within the totality of the letter.

The situation in Thessalonica. The major English speaking translation of Scripture (NRSV), translates *θλίψις* as 'persecution', a position that Légasse rejects. No one would dispute his right to do so. But is it sufficient to argue against such an understanding and in favor of social marginalization by merely citing a secondary source and then concluding that this scholar 'a bien montré la dislocation sociologique et la provocation que constituait l'adoption de la nouvelle foi, exclusive et intransigeante, dans la société polythéiste gréco-romaine' (53, n. 5)? But if marginalization is the key problem that the Thessalonian Christians faced, what exactly is it in Paul and the Lord that they will have imitated (1 Thess 1,6)? Was it the fact that Jesus and Paul were sociologically marginalized or the fact that both suffered and were persecuted? The lack of an in depth description of the entire cultic and civic background of Thessalonica works against the possibility of seeing the overall situation and result in negative evaluations of possible parallels that point to such a cultural and social setting.

Related to this concern is the question of Paul's own context. One never receives a clear sense from Légasse who Paul is and specifically what factors shaped his thought. What kind of a Jew was Paul and in what ways did the Graeco-Roman culture in which he carried out his ministry influence his thinking? This commentary gives only indistinct clues. In dealing with the theme of sexuality in 1 Thess 4, Légasse simply says that Paul's views are dependent on his 'culture native' (230) or on 'la Synagogue judéo-hellénistique' (230). Since such references are insufficient to properly identify Paul's theology, the value of our author's extensive allusion to other ancient authors, both Jewish and Greek, are less than helpful because it is never quite clear how these allusions should be related to Paul and how they assist us in interpreting the Pauline text under consideration. In what ways is it helpful for the interpretation of Paul that a certain term or theme is used by Philo, Qumran and in a variety of places in the Bible when the framework of Paul's theology has not been fully assessed?

The issue of Acts and the question of chronology. This commentary never engages in a systematic or comprehensive methodological discussion of the relationship of Acts to the Pauline letters in general and to 1 Thessalonians in particular. Thus, at points, the information given by Acts concerning chronology is accepted as accurate and at other points, as in the description of the events in Thessalonica in Acts 17, is regarded as largely inaccurate. As a result, Légasse argues that the description of the events in Thessalonica sheds no light on the interpretation found in 1 Thess 2,13-16. By accepting the traditional chronology of Acts and by dating 1 Thessalonians as late as 51 AD, the fact that Paul does not talk about major theological issues such as the

law and justification is attributed to the fact that Paul simply found it unnecessary to discuss them (56). Such a position allows little room for Paul's theological response to mature as he is confronted by substantially new challenges.

Let us now turn to some examples of specific exegesis.

Is it accurate to conclude that the triad 'faith, love and hope' in 1 Thess 1, 3 are 'presque interchangeables' (77)? Such is hardly the case in 1 Thessalonians. The triad appears again in 1 Thess 5,8, in the same order as in 1,3, and this is different from the order found in 1 Cor 13,13, 'faith, hope and love'. If these terms are simply interchangeable, as Légasse asserts, why is ἐλπίς absent in 1 Thess 3,6? Further, how does this absence relate to Paul's desire to 'supply what is lacking in your faith' (3,10) as well as to the unusual stress on the parousia in this letter? These facts are never adequately related to one another. With regard to v. 10, is it sufficient to argue that 'il souhaite pouvoir compléter, améliorer une vie chrétienne déjà satisfaisante quoique toujours perfectible' (191)?

In 4,13-16, one needs to raise several queries. With regard to the reference in 4,13 to not 'having you ignorant', is it sufficient to suggest that this phrase simply emphasizes the importance of that which follows (243), or should not this phrase have been discussed in relationship to the several occurrences of οἶδατε in the letter? And, one needs to ask, whether it can be persuasively demonstrated that the primary function of καθὼς οἶδατε in 2,2 is to introduce 'l'apologie' that follows? Might it not be intended to foster a particular relationship of renewed confidence and trust between the three letter writers and the church at Thessalonica? And, if so, for what purpose? Further, with regard to 4,13-18, Légasse's previously described ambiguity with regard to his definition of ἐλπίς emerges again. He observes that '...aucun lien causal n'est ici établi entre la tristesse et le manque d'espérance chez les non-chrétiens' (247). From the perspective of this reviewer, such an evaluation simply misses the point of the problems that surround ἐλπίς, not only in this text but also with regard to its broader implications for understanding Paul's purpose in writing this letter to the Christians in Thessalonica. Finally, Légasse's sharp criticism of Merklein's proposal that the 'word of the Lord' is a prophetic revelation from the Risen Christ to Paul is ineffectively countered with the proposal that Paul is simply elaborating a previous instruction. To dismiss Merklein because Paul does not use the phrase κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν is hardly likely to be persuasive.

The section of the commentary dealing with 2 Thessalonians is just shy of 100 pages. Légasse rejects Pauline authorship and asserts that there is no likely relationship of this relatively late (late first century/early second century) pseudonymous letter to Thessalonica. The main intention of the letter can be found in 2 Thess 1,5-10 and 2,1-12, verses that emphasize the support of the readers in their difficult circumstances and the assurance that Christ will take revenge on their enemies. Similar positive and negative comments as were made above with regard to the exegesis of 1 Thessalonians can be made here as well: one is again impressed with the many detailed and thoroughly competent word studies of particularly troublesome phrases, such as κατέχον/κατέχων/κατέχειν, but one is disappointed in the failure to analyze the genre of 2 Thessalonians and, thus, to properly distinguish it from

the rhythm and purpose of 1 Thessalonians. Although the important volumes of Frank Hughes (*Early Christian Rhetoric and 2 Thessalonians* [JSNTSS 30; Sheffield 1989]) and others are cited, their contributions to a more comprehensive understanding of the epistolography and rhetoric of the letter are never taken up.

The lack of modern author and ancient textual indexes reduces the ability of the reader to make easy reference to the often exhaustive references to other literature on 1 and 2 Thessalonians.

Smith College
Northampton, MA 01063 (USA)

Karl P. DONFRIED

David A. DE SILVA, *Perseverance in Gratitude. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews"*. Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000. xix-560 p. 16 × 23,5. \$40.00.

Like most other commentaries, de Silva's treats the usual introductory issues. In his view, Hebrews, not a letter but an elaborate piece of homiletic rhetoric, was written in the first century, probably before 70, by a member of the Pauline mission to an unidentified Christian audience not necessarily of Jewish background, to reinforce that community's commitment and mutual solidarity.

But the commentary attempts to do more than treat the usual exegetical issues. Its 'socio-rhetorical' approach, inspired by the work of Vernon Robbins, makes two distinctive contributions to the study of Hebrews. In assessing the literary genre of the text, de Silva begins with an admirably succinct and lucid exposition of ancient rhetorical theory. He recognizes that the contributions of ancient rhetoric to Hebrews come more in the form of embellishment and argumentative strategy (e.g. *synkrisis*), than in arrangement. He offers an extended treatment of the issue of the rhetorical genre in which to classify Hebrews, finally settling on 'deliberative', while recognizing significant elements of 'epideictic'. Much of the discussion of the rhetorical dimension of Hebrews is familiar.

The more innovative 'sociological' portion of the methodology involves two major sets of categories familiar from recent treatments of the 'social world' of the ancient Mediterranean. In de Silva's estimation, the problem addressed by Hebrews was occasioned by the mechanisms of an 'honor-shame' culture. Whatever else was happening in the lives of the addressees, they were subject to opprobrium and treated with disrespect by their neighbors. In Jesus they could find a model of one who accepted earthly dishonor and marginal status and who thereby achieved a new, heavenly status that also awaits his faithful followers. De Silva had already developed this perspective on Hebrews in his 1995 dissertation, *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*

(SBLDS 152; Atlanta 1995), and had offered a survey of this approach to the analysis of the New Testament in *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation* (Collegeville 1999).

Some applications of the categories of honor and shame seem to reflect more contemporary anthropological theory than ancient evidence. Hebrews, however, yields itself quite readily to an analysis that focuses on these values, particularly with its portrait of the exemplars of faith: Abraham, the alien and sojourner (11,13), Moses, who accepted Messianic abuse (11,26), and of course, Christ, who despised the shame of the cross (12,2), and who inspires his followers to a similar stance (13,13).

The second social category that de Silva finds helpful for unpacking Hebrews is that of patron-client. He argues that Hebrews consistently draws a picture of God as benefactor or patron, while Christ, the 'mediator' (8,6), functions as a broker in a patron-client relationship. The homily reminds the addressees of the gratitude they owe to their benefactor and his reliable broker and the fidelity that they should display to them in return for what they have done.

The application of this category is less convincing than the use of 'honor and shame' as an organizing principle for the whole of the text. It does illuminate some aspects of the complex Christological imagery and rhetorical strategy of Hebrews and is explicit in some passages, such as 7,22 and 9,15, and perhaps 5,1-4. Yet the 'mediation' of the broker in question looks quite odd from the point of view of ordinary brokers, who seldom give their lives in facilitating reciprocity. Thus, if Hebrews is using such social categories, he does so with a hint of irony. It is difficult, moreover, to see how the image 'broker' relationship fully captures the activity of Jesus as ἀρχηγός (2,10). Thus other social categories beside that of 'broker' play a significant role in the text's reflection on the role of Christ.

The commentary itself treats many of the issues that confront any student of the text, although it avoids detailed, more technical discussions of issues such as text-criticism. For such matters the reader is often directed to a recent critical commentary, particularly those by Attridge, Lane, and Ellsworth. De Silva regularly does, however, cite apt parallel materials from scripture and from Greco-Roman sources, which are often quoted at length.

De Silva organizes the commentary into 10 segments (1,1-2,18; 3,1-4,13; 4,14-5,10; 5,11-6,20; 7,1-8,13; 9,1-10,18; 10,19-39; 11,1-12,3; 12,4-29; 13,1-25). Each section begins with an overview; then follows a detailed commentary, a summary, and a section on 'bridging the horizons', which suggests pastoral or homiletic applications. Similar pastoral sections conclude the preface and the work as a whole.

Several excursuses, labeled 'closer looks', treat a variety of topics. Some deal with relevant religio-historical issues: 'Angels in Intertestamental Judaism' (93-94); 'Priestly Messiahs in the Intertestamental Period' (122-124); 'Voluntary Death and Atonement' (275-278). Some treat traditional cruxes in the text. "'Perfection" in Hebrews' (194-204) offers a finely nuanced discussion of that difficult theme. Two excursus deal with the severe warning passages: 'Is Apostasy the "Unpardonable Sin"?' (234-236) and 'Patronage, Eternal Security, and Second Repentance' (240-244). The latter exemplifies the kind of creative interpretive strategy of the commentary as a

whole. De Silva suggests that the rhetoric of 6,4 finds an apt parallel in Seneca's rhetoric about reciprocity in *De beneficiis*. Patrons, or benefactors, are told to give as if expecting nothing in return. Clients, recipients of patronal favors, are told that they should never forget the debt they owe to their benefactors. A recipient could be encouraged to be thankful by the thought that failure to do so would forever remove him from his patron's beneficence. A patron, on the other hand, might be encouraged to be beneficent even to the ungrateful. De Silva argues that the rhetoric of Hebrews should be construed as hortatory discourse of this sort directed at clients of the divine patron. Such a discourse is not designed to say anything about the way that the ultimate patron might behave, but only to motivate the clients to appropriate attitudes and action.

Other excursuses introduce sociological considerations: 'The Divine Other and Sustaining Minority Cultural Values' (171-174); 'Citizenship and Sojourning' (394-395). Others expand on the literary parallels noted in the detailed commentary: 'Athletic Imagery and Moral Exhortation' (361-364); 'Gratitude in Greco-Roman Ethics' (474-476).

De Silva's work is a welcome addition to the literature on Hebrews. It offers fresh new insights on a number of traditional problems and suggests a coherent reading of the letter as a whole that in turn lends itself to a contemporary pastoral appropriation, even if the complexity of the text's Christological imagery transcends the social categories deployed here as analytical tools. Students of Hebrews will need to go elsewhere for treatment of some of the more technical issues, but even veteran scholars will learn from de Silva's careful attention to social and rhetorical features of this text.

Yale University Divinity School
New Haven, CT 06511 (USA)

Harold W. ATTRIDGE

Varia

Paul V. MANKOWSKI, *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew* (HSS 47). Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2000. xviii-232 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$29.95

In this work Mankowski examines 103 Hebrew lexical entries to determine the relationship between each word and its possible loans or cognates in Akkadian. The first chapter introduces previous, related studies and considers the means of distinguishing between loanwords, loan adaptations (not true loanwords according to phonological rules, but adopted in the receptor language without alteration), culture words, trans-Aramaic loans (those from Akkadian to Hebrew via Aramaic), cognates, and other possible loan relationships. The result is a careful and reasonably complete set of

distinctions for analysis of lexical relationships.

This chapter also introduces the reader to the format of the inventory and analysis of possible loans that constitutes chap. 2. The list of possible loans is presented in alphabetical order, according to verbal root or nominal form. There are three absolute categories of certainty that are expressed for any entry. Either it is doubtful as a loan (the lexical entry appears in brackets), it is uncertain as to its loan relationship (the entry is introduced with a question mark), or it is certain as a loan (the entry is introduced without notation). Although the discussion that follows the entry provides detail concerning the nature of certainty for the lexical item, there is no absolute gradation of certainty beyond these three categories. Each entry is glossed, the biblical forms and references are listed, a one-line schematic summary of any suggested loan hypothesis is provided, related words in Akkadian and other Semitic and Near Eastern (and occasionally Greek and Latin) languages are given, and normally a discussion of the nature of the relationship is then provided. These elaborations describe the specifics of the arguments for exchanges between languages.

Mankowski is aware of the customary phonological rules for borrowing and able to take into account a wide variety of possibilities as to any relationships between lexemes in various languages. His arguments examine a variety of suggested relationships and opt for the simplest means of analyzing the connection between possible loans. He relies heavily upon the work of S. Kaufman, *Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* (Assyriological Studies 19; Chicago 1974), for both methodology and for the analysis of most loans. Although occasionally disagreeing with Kaufman, the impression is that the work takes on the character of a supplement to Kaufman for specifically Hebrew words, updating and clarifying discussions. This is not bad in itself, as Kaufman's work has become a standard reference in the field, and as the specifically relevant loans for Biblical Hebrew needed to be collected and presented in light of recent analysis.

Following the analysis of each of the lexemes, which comprises the bulk of the book, there is a chapter that provides an overview of the phonological shifts from Akkadian to Hebrew, arranged according to the various consonantal groupings as well as the vowels. This summarizes data for the words already studied insofar as they constitute 'reasonably certain loans'. Mankowski numbers these at about seventy. In addition, he incorporates Akkadian month names that occur in biblical Hebrew. He also uses personal and place names as supplementary evidence. An appendix of ten pages lists all the loans, first according to Hebrew spelling and then by means of the Akkadian lexical entry. There are frequency charts of loans according to each book of the Hebrew Bible as well as a listing of loans by typology of the donor language. Here the categories of legal-administrative, technical, and cultic-religious possess the largest number of loans. A bibliography, as well as indices of words and biblical passages, conclude the work.

The volume provides an important and useful update on earlier semantic and etymological studies of loanwords in the West Semitic languages. In fact, for Akkadian loanwords into Hebrew, nothing comprehensive has been published since H. Zimmern's 1917 work, *Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluss*. Although possible loans are not

difficult to locate, a successful means of distinguishing them from cognates is not easy to obtain and requires a wide ranging set of skills in the various languages of the ancient Near East. Mankowski has done students of Hebrew loanwords and semantics a service and his research now forms a necessary foundation on which further research can build.

While no one will agree with every analysis and decision, the following points may be made. For אֶרֶץ, no mention is made of D.T. Tsumura, *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2. A Linguistic Investigation* (JSOTSS 83; Sheffield 1989) 93-116, whose thorough analysis postulates an alternate explanation to an Akkadian intermediary for the originally Sumerian term behind the one found in the Hebrew text of Gen 2,6. This is at least a possible alternative to Mankowski's suggestion of an emendation. For אֶשְׁכֶּרֶת, אֶשְׁכֶּרֶת, and others, it would be useful to observe that these words also occur in Hebrew inscriptions of the Iron Age. Even though the work is limited to research on biblical Hebrew, this evidence for loanwords may provide some control data regarding the dating of their appearance in West Semitic. Given the philosophy of the BDB lexicon regarding triliteral roots, it is not surprising to find that מֶכֶסֶךְ occurs under the root, KSS. However, is it necessary to cite this sort of thing from a lexicon that is a century old, only to disprove it? It is not clear why there is no mention that שְׁכָל occurs in Aramaic, especially as it is found in biblical Aramaic (cf. Dan 5,2). Contrast אֶשְׁכֶּרֶת where the Aramaic attestations are listed both in terms of various dialects and by providing the specific occurrences in biblical Aramaic. There seems to be an inconsistency in this. Finally, the Amarna Canaanite evidence cited proves that the Canaanite shift had taken place in at least some West Semitic dialects, though it is not clear if it occurred in all by the fourteenth century.

One could wish for further analysis of the statistical data on the frequency of the loanwords according to biblical book and typological distribution. Although comparison is made with the latter in terms of the results from Kaufman's work (both are similar in terms of percentages of distribution of loanwords in the categories, except that there is a greater percentage of cultic-religious loans in the Bible), there is little discussion of the matter. Keeping in mind the fact that not all loanwords could be identified and that the percentage of trans-Akkadian loans should be greater than loanwords that originated in Akkadian, the distribution by biblical book remains an interesting study. It is not surprising that many of the larger books have more than ten loans each (Isaiah: 17, Jeremiah: 15, Ezekiel: 11, Psalms: 12, 2 Chronicles: 13) or that a book such as Nehemiah has eleven loanwords. However, is it significant that Job and Proverbs each have only six, and 1 Chronicles has four? The importance of these and other conclusions remains to be addressed.

Overall, Mankowski's work succeeds in what it attempts to do. It provides a clear discussion of possible loanwords from Akkadian by carefully applying phonological and semantic guidelines for the comparative study of Semitic languages.

Denver Seminary
P.O. Box 100,000
Denver, CO 80250-0100 (USA)

Richard S. HESS

John DAY, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan* (JSOTSS 265). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 282 p. 16 × 24

Day provides a detailed study of the various gods of Palestine on the basis of biblical testimony and archaeological evidence. His volume has seven chapters dedicated to an evaluation of the following deities: El, Asherah, Baal (two chapters), Astarte and Anat, the heavenly deities (Sun, Moon, and Lucifer-the daystar), and the underworld deities (Mot, Resheph, Molech, and Rephaim). Day reviews the essential critical issues associated each deity and the various opinions provided by other scholars. He offers his own viewpoints, often responding directly to the opinions of other authors. His volume is a magnificent compendium of the current debate on the gods of Palestine and their relationship to Yahweh with his own significant views on these crucial issues included.

His presentation is terse; a great deal is said with economy of language. He is very aware of the issues involved in the debate, the views of significant scholars, and the essential bibliography. His ability to present the issues, the scholars, and the sources in a well organized fashion make this an exceptionally fine resource for scholars and graduate students interested in the evolution of pre-exilic Israelite religion. His arguments are presented in extremely cogent fashion; he writes incisively yet with a balanced approach. Some issues are addressed with but a paragraph and others receive several pages of comment, depending of the importance of the discussion among contemporary scholars. His mastery of comparative texts is evident, especially the Ugaritic texts, and this provides a solid authority for the opinions he expresses.

In general, Day makes certain assumptions in his methodological approach that might be challenged by some scholars. He tends to distinguish between Canaanites and Israelites in terms of religious belief systems, unlike minimalists who would declare that Israelite and Canaanite religion was the same phenomenon prior to the exile. He does recognize great fluidity between the two religions; Israelite belief to a great extent grew out of Canaanite belief. He assumes that the persona of Yahweh very early onward was that of a separate deity, and that Yahweh's convergence with and differentiation from the other gods began to occur from the time of the united monarchy. In this regard, his assumptions are similar to many other scholars in the field (such as Mark Smith), arguing neither for an early date nor a late date for Yahweh's emergence.

Though he does not directly address the question of how and when the evolution of monotheism occurred among the Israelites, his evaluations provide much grist for that scholarly debate. His views would dovetail most nicely with paradigms which assume the gradual emergence of monolatry and forms of proto-monotheism in the pre-exilic period leading to the ultimate culmination of monotheistic belief in the Babylonian Exile. Thus, his is another voice in what appears to be a growing consensus about the development of Israelite religion.

Though I cannot recount all of the insightful critical viewpoints argued in the book, the following list includes the major issues addressed by Day. (1)

Yahweh was not a manifestation of El at first (contra F. Cross), but was a totally different deity who absorbed El only in later years (13-17). (2) Specific shared characteristics of El and Yahweh included old age, wisdom, world creation, a heavenly court ('sons of God'), and a dwelling place in paradise (17-34). (3) Initially Asherah was a goddess, but by the time of the divided monarchy (and in the Kuntillet 'Ajrud inscription) Asherah was a wooden cult object (42-62). (4) Post-exilic wisdom was not used to debunk Asherah worship (contra B. Lang) (66-67). (5) Jezebel's baal was Baal-Shamem of Tyre, not Melkart of Tyre (contra R. de Vaux) (73-77). (6) Ps 29 appropriates Baal imagery, but it is not a converted Baal hymn, as H.L. Ginsberg, T. Gaster, and F. Cross believe (95-98). (7) The Bible appropriates a story about Baal's battle with the dragon (Leviathan) which is a separate myth from the one about the battle with the sea (Yam). The dragon's defeat is a creation account, the sea's defeat is not. The myth of the dragon inspired Ps 104, which later inspired Gen 1 (98-102). (8) In Job 40-41 the beasts are chaos monsters, not ordinary animals, like the hippopotamus and crocodile (102-103). (9) The dragon conflict lies behind Dan 7 and Rev 12 (105-107). (10) Mt. Zaphon in the Bible does not mean 'north' or Mt. Casius, but usually it is Jerusalem and the Temple where Yahweh resides (107-116). (11) Resurrection imagery comes from the Baal cult through the book of Daniel (not from Zoroastrianism, as W. Bousset, M. Boyce, and B. Lang suggest) (116-127). (12) Astarte is a separate deity from Asherah, and she is the Queen of heaven in Jeremiah. The Queen of heaven cannot be Shapash (M. Dahood), Asherah (K. Koch, O. Keel, and C. Uehlinger), Anat (A. Vincent, W.F. Albright, and M. Cogan), or Ishtar (W. Rudolph, A. Weiser, M. Weinfeld, and W. Rast) (128-132, 144-150). (13) Most references to Anat in the Bible are dubious (132-142). (14) Anat was another pre-exilic consort of Yahweh, in addition to Asherah, and she was revered as Anat-Yahu at Elephantine after the exile (142-144). (15) Contra G. Taylor, H.-P. Stähli, H. Niehr, O. Keel, C. Uehlinger, and E. Lipinski, Yahweh was not equated with the sun; the sun was one of the 'heavenly host' (156-163). (16) Worship of the sun, moon, and other luminaries were native Canaanite customs and not introduced by Arameans or Assyrians (contra H. Spieckermann) (passim). (17) Lucifer or the daystar in Isa 14 is Venus or the Canaanite deity Athtar. The myth of Athtar's attempt to assume Baal's throne did not inspire this chapter (contra J. Gray, P. Grelot, G. Fohrer, W.F. Albright, P. Craigie, and W. Watson), for Isa 14 testifies to a violent assault. Rather, there is a separate, but lost, myth from Jebusite Jerusalem, not Ugarit, which inspired it, as evidenced by the allusions to Elyon and Zaphon (Zion). Ultimately, Isa 14 is a metaphor for the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BCE, thus arising later than many suggest (166-184). (18) Isa 14 and Ezek 28 are distinct accounts (contra J. McKenzie and A. Ohler), inspired by different Canaanite myths, one about a god and the other about the first man (175-179). (19) Resheph is a plague deity personified as 'pestilence' in the Bible (199-208). (20) Molech is a god, not a sacrifice, and real human sacrifice was offered to him. He is different from Milkom and Mot, and not to be equated with Yahweh (209-216). (21) Rephaim evolved from being divinized underworld beings to become ethnic giants, and they are never associated with the dolmens in Palestine (contra P. Karge) (217-225). (22) Contra Tigay, the extensive use of Yahwistic personal names does

not exclude the worship of other deities (227-229). And 23) Josiah's reform was historical (contra E. Würthwein) (229-233). Pagination is listed to provide an idea of the extent to which Day discusses some of these issues.

Though it would be presumptuous to challenge Day on these well argued positions, I would hazard a humble response to a few of his arguments. (1) His belief that the metaphors in Job 40-41 are not to animals might be iconoclastic. Perhaps the biblical author has a double entendre metaphor which merges chaos beast imagery with actual animal imagery. Biblical authors can be quite creative. (2) I would not underestimate the extent to which Zoroastrianism might have further developed and refined the biblical concept of resurrection. Zoroastrianism might not have planted the seed of resurrection thought in Judaism, but it might have been the most responsible for development of the idea in the post-exilic era. (3) Just because the Ugaritic myth of Athtar did not involve violence in seizing the mountain does not make it necessary to hypothesize another myth. Maybe this is an example of a very creative re-working of a myth by the biblical author, crafted to correspond with the historical destruction of Jerusalem. (4) In general, Day seems rather quick to suggest separate myths for the inspiration of various accounts rather than to assume that one account loosely inspired a creative rearticulation by the biblical author. (5) Rephaim appear to have no connection with dolmens perhaps only because we have not found any references. My sense is that in the complex social-historical process of Israel's evolution over many centuries and in many places there could be oblique connections between myths and historical memories. Day's rigorous and superb logic in evaluating texts and terms may lead him to be a little dogmatic at times in denying connections between various accounts. However, in the great majority of instances I find myself concurring with Day, even applauding some of his arguments. His method is good and his instincts for assessing material in a specific debate are excellent.

With this volume critical scholars and graduate students have an excellent resource for the discussion of pre-exilic Israelite understandings of the other gods and their relationships to Yahweh. Despite its relatively small size (233 pages) the text covers many issues in detailed fashion. The volume can be consulted on individual issues with ease because of its tight organizational structure and clarity of presentation. It is an essential resource for those observing or engaging in the debates concerning pre-exilic Israelite religion.

Loyola University
6363 St. Charles Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70118 (USA)

Robert GNUSE

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

International Conference on Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition

The 51st annual meeting of the *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense* will be held at the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium, on July 31 – August 2, 2002. The conference will focus on Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls, their mutual relationship and their relationship to biblical Wisdom and Apocalypticism. Proposals for short papers (20 min.) should be submitted to the President before February 28, 2002:

F. García Martínez
Faculteit der godgeleerdheid
Sint Michielstraat, 6
B-3000 Leuven

Tel: + 32 16 324557

Fax: + 32 16 323858

E-mail: F.Garcia.Martinez@theo.kuleuven.ac.be

For accommodation and registration, please contact the Office of the *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense*, Paul-Adrian VI-College, Hogeschoolplein 3, B-3000 Leuven; tel: + 32 16 324468; fax: + 32 16 324465; e-mail: wim.verschooten@theo.kuleuven.ac.be.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

The following list mentions all the books on biblical and related studies sent recently to *Biblica*, including those which may not actually be reviewed in this journal. Inclusion of a book in the list is no indication of an editorial opinion concerning it.

Books sent to this journal will not be returned to the senders, even if no review of them is published in it, unless sent at the request of the editors of *Biblica*.

Books, articles and offprints from periodicals sent to *Biblica* will be made available to the editor of the *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography*.

Please address all books, correspondence, etc., to: Editorial Office, *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta, 25, I-00187 Rome, Italy.

Grégoire de Nysse, *Discours Catéchétique* (SC 453). Texte grec de E. Mühlenberg (*GNO* III, IV). Introduction, traduction et notes par Raymond Winling. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2000. 360 p. 12,5 × 19,5. FF 222

Grelot, Pierre, *L'Épître de saint Paul aux Romains*. Une lecture pour aujourd'hui. Versailles, Éditions Saint-Paul, 2001. 227 p. 15 × 22,5. FF 120 – € 18,30

Grelot, Pierre, *Le langage symbolique dans la Bible*. Enquête de sémantique et d'exégèse (Initiations bibliques). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001. 237 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 148

Grey, Mary, *Introducing Feminist Images of God* (Introductions in Feminist Theology 7). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 133 p. 15,5 × 23. £12.95 – \$19.95

Habel, Norman C. – **Wurst**, Shirley (eds.), *The Earth Story in Genesis* (The Earth Bible 2). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 236 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £16.95 – \$28.50

Habel, Norman C. (ed.), *Readings from the Perspective of Earth* (The Earth Bible 1). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 279 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £16.95 – \$28.50

Hanson, James S., *The Endangered Promises*. Conflict in Mark (SBLDS 171). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. x-273 p. 14 × 23. \$45.00

Harris, J. Gordon – **Brown**, Cheryl A. – **Moore**, Michael S., *Joshua, Judges, Ruth* (New International Biblical Commentary. Old Testament Series 5). Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers – Carlisle, Paternoster Press, 2000. xvii-398 p. 14 × 21,5. \$11.95

Hawk, L. Daniel, *Joshua* (Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry). Collegeville, Minnesota, The Liturgical Press, 2000. xxii-303 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$39.95

Heil, John Paul, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*. An Audience-Oriented Approach (SBLMS 52). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 1999. xii-367 p. 16 × 23,5. \$45.00

Heil, John Paul, *The Transfiguration of Jesus*. Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2-8, Matt. 17:1-8 and Luke 9:28-35 (AnBib 144). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000. 367 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 45.000 – \$25.000 – €23,24

Hemer, Colin J., *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in Their Local Setting* (The Biblical Resource Series). Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001. xxii-338 p. 15 × 23. \$29.00 – £19.99

Hempel, Charlotte, *The Damascus Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 124 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £8.95 – \$14.95

Henze, Matthias, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar*. The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4 (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 61). Leiden, Brill, 1999. xii-295. 16 × 24,5. Dfl 169,69 – \$90.00

Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm, *Giosuè, Giudici, Rut* (traduzione e commento di) (Antico Testamento 9). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2001. 446 p. 15 × 23. Lit. 75.000

Hester, David C., *First and Second Samuel* (Interpretation Bible Studies). Louisville, Geneva Press, 2000. viii-118 p. 15 × 23

Heusler, Erika, *Kapitalprozesse im lukanischen Doppelwerk*. Die Verfahren gegen Jesus und Paulus in exegetischer und rechtshistorischer Analyse (NTAbh 38). Münster, Aschendorff, 2000. viii-294 p. 15,5 × 23. DM 78,—

Hostetter, Edwin C., *An Elementary Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Biblical Languages: Hebrew 1). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 176 p. 16 × 24. £18.95 – \$29.95

Inostroza Lanas, Juan Carlos, *Moisés e Israel en el desierto*. El midrás paulino de 1Cor 10,1-13 (Plenitudo Temporis 6). Salamanca, Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia, 2000. 245 p. 17 × 24. Ptas 1.923

Jackson, Bernard S., *Studies in the Semiotics of Biblical Law* (JSOTSS 314). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 332 p. 16 × 24. £53.50 – \$84.00

Jobs, Karen J. – **Silva**, Moisés, *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic – Carlisle, U. K., Paternoster Press, 2000. 351 p. 15,5 × 23,5

The JPS Bible Commentary: Esther אֶסְתֵּר. The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation (The JPS Torah Commentary). Commentary by Adele **Berlin**. Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society, 2001. lix-110 p. 21 × 26. \$34.95

Kaniarakath, George, CMI, *Person and Faith of Apostle Thomas in the Gospels*. New Delhi, Intercultural Publications, 2000. xviii-200 p. 14,5 × 22. Rs 250

Kariamadam, Paul, *Questions People Ask on the Bible*. Bandra, St. Pauls, 2000. 182 p. 13,5 × 21,5. Rs 60.00

Khan, Geoffrey, *Early Karaite Grammatical Texts* (Society of Biblical Literature Masoretic Studies 9). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. x-357 p. 14,5 × 22,5. \$54.95

Kloppenborg Verbin, John S., *Excavating Q*. The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 2000. xii-546 p. 15 × 23. £32.00

Korpel, Marjo C. A. – **Oesch**, Josef M. (eds.), *Delimitation Criticism* (Pericope 1). Assen, Van Gorcum, 2000. vii-365 p. 16 × 24,5. Dfl 176,—

Kreitzer, Larry J. – **Rooke**, Deborah W. (eds.), *Ciphers in the Sand*. Interpretations of the Woman Taken in Adultery (John 7.53–8.11) (The Biblical Seminar 74). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 277 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £15.95 – \$24.95

Kügler, Joachim (Hrsg.), *Die Macht der Nase*. Zur religiösen Bedeutung des Duftes; Religionsgeschichte – Bibel – Liturgie (SBS 187). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000. 191 p. 13,5 × 21. DM 47,80

Legrand, Lucien, *L'Apôtre des Nations? Paul et la stratégie missionnaire des Églises apostoliques* (LD 184). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2000. 153 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 135

Lemaire, André (Collectif édité sous la direction de), *Prophètes et rois*. Bible et Proche-Orient (LD Hors série). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001. 304 p. 13,5 × 21,5. FF 195

Leonardi, Giovanni, *Opera di Luca*. I. Il Vangelo. La biografia kerygmatica di Gesù. Traduzione strutturata, analisi letteraria e narrativa, messaggi e problemi introduttori (Sussidi biblici 70). Reggio Emilia, Edizioni San Lorenzo, 2000. 271 p. 15 × 21. Lit. 28.000

Leonardi, Giovanni, *Opera di Luca*. II. Le gesta delle prime comunità cristiane secondo il piano divino. Traduzione strutturata, analisi letteraria e narrativa, messaggio e problemi introduttori (Sussidi biblici 61). Reggio Emilia, Edizioni San Lorenzo, 2000. 243 p. 15 × 21. Lit. 28.000

Levin, Christoph, *Das Alte Testament* (Wissen 2160). München, Verlag C. H. Beck, 2001. 128 p. 11,5 × 18. DM 14,80 – SFr 14 – ÖS 108,—

Levison, John R., *Texts in Transition*. The Greek *Life of Adam and Eve* (Society of Biblical Literature: Early Judaism and its Literature 16). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. x-123 p. 13,5 × 23,5

Limburg, James, *Psalms* (Westminster Bible Companion). Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 2000. xviii-509 p. 15 × 22,5. \$29.95 – £14.99

Lubac, Henri de, *The Four Senses of Scripture* (Medieval Exegesis 2). Tr. E. M. Macierowski. Grand Rapids, Michigan. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company – Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 2000. xiii-439 p. 16 × 23,5. \$45.00

Lührmann, Dieter (Hrsg.), *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien in griechischer und lateinischer Sprache* (Marburger theologische Studien 59). Marburg, N. G. Elwert Verlag, 2000. vii-199 p. 17 × 24. DM 48,—

Luz, Ulrich, *Matthew 8-20*. A Commentary (Hermeneia). Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2001. xxxvii-608 p. 22 × 24. \$69.00

Macchi, Jean-Daniel – **Römer**, Thomas (éd.), *Jacob*. Commentaire à plusieurs voix / Ein mehrstimmiger Kommentar zu / A Plural Commentary of Gen. 25-35. Mélanges offerts à Albert de Pury (Le Monde de la Bible 44). Genève, Labor et Fides, 2001. 399 p. 15 × 22,5

MacDonald, Margaret Y., *Colossians and Ephesians* (Sacra Pagina Series 17). Collegeville, Minnesota, The Liturgical Press, 2000. xvi-390 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$39.95

Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers, *In the Company of Jesus*. Characters in Mark's Gospel. Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 2000. xx-244p. 12,5 x 19,5

Malherbe, Abraham J., *The Letters to the Thessalonians*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 32B). New York, Doubleday, 2000. xx-508 p. 16 × 24. \$50.00 – Can\$75.00

Malina, Bruce J., *The Social Gospel of Jesus*. The Kingdom of God in Mediterranean Perspective. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2001. xiii-178 p. 14 × 21,5. \$19.00

Martin-Asensio, Gustavo, *Transitivity-Based Foregrounding in the Acts of the Apostles*. A Functional-Grammatical Approach to the Lukan Perspective (JSNTSS 202: Studies in New Testament Greek 8). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 198 p. 16 × 24. £37.00 – \$59.00

Meynet, Roland, «*Tu vois cette femme?*». Parler en Paraboles (Lire la Bible 121). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001. 199 p. 11,5 × 18. FF 98

Miller, James C., *The Obedience of Faith, The Eschatological People of God, and the Purpose of Romans* (SBLDS 177). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. xi-238 p. 14,5 × 22,5. \$45.00

Miller, Patrick D., *Israelite Religion and Biblical Theology*. Collected Essays (JSOTSS 267). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 715 p. 16 × 24. £60.00 – \$95.00

Miller, Patrick D., *The Religion of Ancient Israel* (Library of Ancient Israel). London, SPCK – Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 2000. xx-335 p. 16 × 23,5

Morag, Shelomo – **Bar-Asher**, Moshe – **Mayer-Modena**, Maria (eds.), *Vena Hebraica in Judaeorum Linguis*. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on the Hebrew and Aramaic Elements in Jewish Languages (Milan, October 23-26, 1995) (Studi Camito-Semitica 5). Milano, Università degli Studi, Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità – Jerusalem, The Hebrew University, The Center for Jewish Languages and Literatures, 1999. 431 p. 16,5 × 23

Moskala, Jiří, *The Laws of Clean & Unclean Animals in Leviticus 11*. Their Nature, Theology, & Rationale (Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series 4). Berrien Springs, Adventist Theological Society Publications, 2000. xv-484 p. 15 × 22,5

Naluparayil, Jacob Chacko, *The Identity of Jesus in Mark*. An Essay on Narrative Christology (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 49). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 2000. xviii-636 p. 17 × 24

Neusner, Jacob, *Recovering Judaism*. The Universal Dimension of Judaism. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2000. xiii-201 p. 15 × 23. \$20.00

Niccacci, Alviero – **Pazzini**, Massimo, *Il rotolo di Rut*. מגלת רות. Analisi del testo Ebraico (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum 51). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 2001. 106 p. 17 × 24. \$10.00

Nissinen, Martti (ed.), *Prophecy in its Ancient Near Eastern Context*. Mesopotamian, Biblical, and Arabian Perspectives (SBL Symposium Series 13). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. xii-161 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

Nogalski, James D. – **Sweeney**, Marvin A. (eds.), *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* (SBL Symposium Series 15). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. xviii-235 p. 15 × 23. \$39.95

Novak, David, *L'elezione d'Israele*. L'idea di popolo eletto (Biblioteca di Cultura religiosa 64). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2001. 323 p. 15 × 21. Lit 57.000

Odell, Margaret S. – Strong, John T. (eds.), *The Book of Ezekiel. Theological and Anthropological Perspectives* (SBL Symposium Series 9). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. xiii-270 p. 15 × 23. \$39.95

Oakes, Peter, *Philippians. From people to letter* (SNTSMS 110). Cambridge, University Press, 2001. xv-231 p. 14 × 22

O'Mahony, Kieran J., *Pauline Persuasion. A Sounding in 2 Corinthians 8-9* (JSNTSS 199). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 203 p. 16 × 24. £37.00 – \$59.00

Oredsson, Dag, *Moats in Ancient Palestine* (ConBOT 48). Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2000. 213 p. 15,5 × 22. SEK 222,–

Otto, Eckart (Hrsg.), *Mose. Ägypten und das Alte Testament* (SBS 189). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000. 149 p. 13,5 × 21. DM 41,80

Pardee, Dennis, *Les textes rituels. Fascicules 1 et 2* (Ras Shamra-Ougarit XII). Paris, Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2000. 1307 p. 21 × 30. FF 595

Pathrapankal, Joseph, CMI, *Dimensions of the Word*. Bangalore, Dharmaram Publications, 2000. xvi-343 p. 14 × 21. Rs 250.00 – \$18.00

Perdue, Leo G., *Proverbs* (Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching). Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 2000. xi-298 p. 16 × 23,5. £20.00

Peron, Gian Paolo, *Seguitemi! Vi farò diventare pescatori di uomini* (Mc 1,17). Gli imperativi ed esortativi di Gesù ai discepoli come elementi di un loro cammino formativo (Biblioteca di scienze religiose 162). Roma, LAS, 2000. 324 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 45.000

Pleins, J. David, *The Social Visions of the Hebrew Bible. A Theological Introduction*. Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 2001. xii-592 p. 15 × 23

Porter, Stanley E. – Hayes, Michael A. – Tombs, David (eds.), *Faith in the Millennium* (Roehampton Papers 7). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 493 p. 16 × 24. £56.00 – \$88.00

Prigent, Pierre, *L'Apocalypse de Saint Jean* (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament 14). Édition revue et augmentée. Genève, Labor et Fides, 2000. 507 p. 17,5 × 23,5. FF 298

Pury, Albert de – Römer, Thomas – Macchi, Jean-Daniel (eds.), *Israel Constructs its History* (JSOTSS 306). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 504 p. 16 × 24. £60.00 – \$95.00

Robinson, James M. – Hoffmann, Paul – Kloppenborg, John S. (eds.), *The Critical Edition of Q* (Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible: Supplements). Minneapolis, Fortress Press – Leuven, Peeters Publishers, 2000. cvii-581 p. 21 × 24. \$60.00

Rhee, Victor (Sung-Yul), *Faith in Hebrews. Analysis within the Context of Christology, Eschatology, and Ethics* (Studies in Biblical Literature 19). New York, Peter Lang, 2001. xvi-280 p. 16 × 23,5

Richardson, M. E. J., *Hammurabi's Laws. Text, Translation and Glossary* (The Biblical Seminar 73; Semitic Texts and Studies 2). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 423 p. 16 × 24. Cloth: £56.00 – \$90.00; paper: £22.99 – \$35.00

Romaniello, Giuseppe, *La scrittura apocrica dei primi due capitoli del Vangelo Secondo Marco e Controrevisione della Datazione della Nascita di Cristo*. s. l., s. n., 2000. 207 p. 14,5 × 21. Lit. 50.000 – €25,82

Sacchi, Paolo, *The History of the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSS 285). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 533 p. 16 × 24. £60.00 – \$95.00

Salvestrone, Simonetta, *Dostoevskij e la Bibbia* (Spiritualità orientale). Magnano, Edizioni Qiqajon – Comunità di Bose, 2000. 277 p. 14,5 × 20,5. Lit. 35.000

Sanchez, Sylvain Jean Gabriel, *Justin Apologiste Chrétien*. Travaux sur le Dialogue avec Tryphon de Justin MARTYR (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 50). Paris, J. Gabalda et Cie, 2000. 301 p. 16 × 24. FF 280

Schroeder, Christoph O., *History, Justice, and the Agency of God* (Biblical Interpretation Series 52). Leiden, Brill, 2001. xiv-236 p. 16 × 24,5. Dfl 141,04 – \$79.00

Schwarz, Hans, *Eschatology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000. xv-431 p. 15 × 23. \$26.00 – £16.99

Scippa, Vincenzo, *Il Salmo 72 e il regno messianico di Cristo*. Analisi strutturale e simbolico-retorica (Estratto da 'Credo Ecclesiam': Studi in onore di Antonio Barruffo S. I.). Napoli, M. D'Auria Editore, 2000. pp. 37-62. 16,5 × 24

Segalla, Giuseppe, *Un'etica per tre comunità*. L'etica di Gesù in Matteo, Marco e Luca (Studi biblici 126). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2000. 220 p. 13,5 × 21. Lit. 40.000

Ska, Jean Louis, *Introduction à la Lecture du Pentateuque*. Clés pour l'interprétation des cinq premiers livres de la Bible (Le livre et le rouleau 5). Bruxelles, Éditions Lessius, 2000. 391 p. 14,5 × 20,5

Ska, Jean Louis, *L'argilla, la danza e il giardino*. Saggi di antropologia biblica (Quaderni di Camaldoli 17). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 2000. 66 p. 14 × 21. Lit. 15,000 – €7,75

Ska, Jean Louis, *La Parola di Dio nei racconti degli uomini* (Orizzonti biblici). Assisi, Citadella Editrice, 1999. 151 p. 13 × 19,5. Lit. 25.000 – €12,91

Skemp, Vincent T. M., *The Vulgate of Tobit Compared with Other Ancient Witnesses* (SBLDS 180). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. xii-486 p. 14,5 × 22,5. \$45.00

Society of Biblical Literature: 2000 Seminar Papers (SBL Seminar Papers Series 39). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. 823 p. 15 × 23. \$35.00

Soggin, J. Alberto, *Israele in epoca biblica*. Istituzioni, feste, cerimonie, rituale (Strumenti 4: Biblica). Torino, Claudiana, 2000. 197 p. 17 × 24. Lit. 29.000 – €14,97

Stegemann, Ekkehard W. – Stegemann, Wolfgang, *The Jesus Movement. A Social History of Its First Century*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1999. xx-532 p. 15 × 23. \$25.00

Stone, Michael E. – Wright, Benjamin E. – Satran, David (eds.), *The Apocryphal Ezekiel* (Early Judaism and its Literature 18). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. xii-167 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$45.00

Taylor, Justin, S.M., *Les Actes des deux apôtres*. IV. Commentaire historique (Act. 1,1– 8,40). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2000. xxxii-245. 16 × 24. FF 190

Taylor, Justin, S.M., *Where Did Christianity Come From?* Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 2001. xv-189 p. 13,5 × 21. \$19.95

Thiselton, Anthony C., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. A Commentary on the Greek Text (The New International Greek Testament Commentary). Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; Carlisle, The Paternoster Press, 2000. xxxiii-1446 p. 15,5 × 24,5. \$75.00

Thottakara, Augustine, CMI (ed.), *Indian Interpretation of the Bible*. Festschrift in honour of Prof. Dr. Joseph Pathrapankal, CMI. Bangalore, Dharmaram Publications, 2000. 491 p. 14 × 21. Rs 350.00 – \$22.00

Trimpe, Birgit, *Von der Schöpfung bis zur Zerstreuung*. Intertextuelle Interpretationen der biblischen Urgeschichte (Gen 1–11) (Osnabrücker Studien zur Jüdischen und Christlichen Bibel 1). Osnabrück, Universitätsverlag Rasch, 2000. 238 p. 16,5 × 24

Turner, John D. – **Majercik**, Ruth (eds.), *Gnosticism and Later Platonism*. Themes, Figures, and Texts (Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 12). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2000. xiii-338 p. 15 × 23. \$44.95

VanderKam, James C., *An Introduction to Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001. xii-234p. 15 × 23. \$18.00 – £11.99

Vanni, Ugo, S.J., *L'ebbrezza nello Spirito*. (1Cor 12,13; Ef 5,18). Una proposta di spiritualità paolina (Bibbia e Preghiera 38). Roma, Edizioni ADP, 2000. 238 p. 14 × 21

Vásquez Allegue, Jaime, *Los Hijos de la Luz y los Hijos de las Tinieblas*. El prólogo de la Regla de la Comunidad de Qumrán (Biblioteca Midrásica de la Institución de San Jerónimo 21). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 2000. 433 p. 16 × 23,5

Venema, Geert Johan, *Schriftuurlijke verhalen in het Oude Testament*. Deuteronomium 9–10; 31, II Koningen 22–23, Jeremia 36, Nehemia 8. Delft, Uitgeverij Eburon, 2000. x-269 p. 17 × 24. Dfl 59,50

Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. 26/2. *Apocalypsis Johannis*. 2. Lieferung: Einleitung (Fortsetzung und Schluss): Apc. 1,1–2,7. Hrsg. Roger **Gryson**. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2000. pp. 81-160. 24 × 32

Vetus Latina: 44. Arbeitsbericht der Stiftung, 33. Bericht des Instituts. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2000. 48 p. 15 × 21

Vouga, François, *Une théologie du Nouveau Testament* (Le Monde de la Bible 43). Genève, Labor et Fides, 2001. 474 p. 15 × 22,5. SFr 60 – FF 240

Walsh, Carey Ellen, *The Fruit of the Vine: Viticulture in Ancient Israel* (HSM 60). Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2000. ix-294 p. 16 × 23,5. \$29.95

Walsh, Jerome T., *Style and Structure in Biblical Hebrew Narrative*. Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 2001. xiv-205 p. 15 × 22,5. \$19.95

Wenk, Matthias, *Community-Forming Power*. The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts (Journal of Pentecostal Theology Studies 19). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 368 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £15.95 – \$21.95

Williamson, Paul R., *Abraham, Israel and the Nations*. The Patriarchal Promise and its Covenantal Development in Genesis (JSOTSS 315). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 309 p. 16 × 24. £53.50 – \$84.00

Winter, Bruce W., *After Paul Left Corinth*. The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K.,

William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2001. xx-344 p. 15 × 23,5. \$28.00 – £17.99

Witherington, Ben, *The Gospel of Mark*. A Social-Rhetorical Commentary. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001. xxiv-436 p. 16 × 23,5. \$35.00 – £23.99

Woods, Edward J., *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSS 205). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2001. 305 p. 16 × 24. £53.50 – \$84.00

Yong, Amos, *Discerning the Spirit(s)*. A Pentecostal-Charismatic Contribution to Christian Theology of Religions (Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 20). Sheffield, Academic Press, 2000. 392 p. 15,5 × 23. £15.95 – \$21.95

Zamora, José-Ángel, *La vid y el vino en Ugarit* (Banco de Datos Filológicos Noroccidentales: Monografías 6). Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2000. xvii-764 p. 18 × 25

Zornberg, Avivah Gottlieb, *The Particulars of Rapture*. Reflections on Exodus. New York, Doubleday, 2001. 582 p. 16 × 24. \$35.00 – Can\$53.00

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606.

E-mail: atla@atla.com. <http://www.atla.com/>

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

Finito di stampare il 19 dicembre 2001

Tip. «Don Bosco» – Via Prenestina, 468 – 00171 Roma